arXiv:0805.4632v1 [math.DS] 29 May 2008

QUASI PERIODIC SOLUTIONS OF NONLINEAR RANDOM SCHRÖDINGER EQUATIONS

J. Bourgain† and W-M. Wang*

Contents

1. Introduction and statement of the theorem
2. Hamiltonian representation and Lyapunov-Schmidt decomposition
3. Newton scheme
4. P-equations and statements in θ
5. Invertibility of $T(y_i)$, Q-equations and determination of ω
6. Construction of y_i and completion of the assemblage
7. Proof of the theorem
8. Appendix: Localization results for random Schrödinger operators

---

W.-M. Wang thanks the Institute for Advanced Study for hospitality, where part of this work was done.

†Partially supported by NSF grant DMS-03-22370

*Partially supported by NSF grant DMS-97-29992 and DMS 0503563

Typeset by $\mathcal{AMS}$-TEX

1. Introduction and statement of the theorem

The nonlinear random Schrödinger equation.

We seek time quasi-periodic solutions to the nonlinear random Schrödinger equation

$$i\frac{\partial}{\partial t}u = (\epsilon\Delta + V)u + \delta|u|^{2p}u \qquad (p>0), \tag{1.1}$$

on $\mathbb{Z}^d \times [0,\infty)$, where $0<\epsilon,\delta \ll 1$, Δ is the discrete Laplacian:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{ij} &= 1, \quad |i-j|_{\ell^1}=1,\\ &=0, \quad \text{otherwise,} \end{aligned} \tag{1.2}$$

$V=\{v_j\}_{j\in\mathbb{Z}^d}$, the potential, is a family of *time independent* independently identically distributed (i.i.d.) random variables with common distribution $g=\tilde{g}(v_j)dv_j$, $\tilde{g}\in L^\infty$. We also assume supp g is a bounded set. The probability space is taken to be

$$\mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{Z}^d} \text{with measure} \prod_{j\in\mathbb{Z}^d} g(v_j) = \prod_{j\in\mathbb{Z}^d} \tilde{g}(v_j)dv_j,\ \tilde{g}\in L^\infty,\ \text{supp } g \text{ is a bounded set.} \tag{1.3}$$

$V=\{v_j\}_{j\in\mathbb{Z}^d}$ serve as parameters for the nonlinear problem in (1.1).

Given an initial condition $u(0)$ in $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^d)$, one of the central questions is whether $u(t)$ remains localized for all t, i.e., if $u(0)\in\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^d)$, $\forall\kappa$, can one find R, such that

$$\|u(t)\|_{\ell^2(\{\mathbb{Z}\backslash[-R,R]\}^d)} < \kappa,\ \forall t? \tag{1.4}$$

(From now on, we write $|\ |$ for $|\ |_{\ell^1}$, $\|\ \|$ for $\|\ \|_{\ell^2}$.) When $\epsilon=\delta=0$, the answer to (1.4) is affirmative. Since $u(0)=\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}^d} a_j\delta_j$, $a_j\to 0$, as $|j|\to\infty$, $u(t)=\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}^d} a_j\delta_j e^{-iv_jt}$ is almost-periodic (infinite number of frequencies) and the upper bound in (1.4) is trivially verified.

In this paper, for appropriate initial conditions $u(0)$, we construct time quasi-periodic solutions to (1.1). So the answer to (1.4) is affirmative for such $u(0)$'s. This is the content of the Theorem and its Corollary.

Before we enter into the heart of the matter, we first address question (1.4) to

The linear random Schrödinger equation.

When $\delta=0$, (1.1) reduces to the linear random Schrödinger equation:

$$\begin{aligned} i\frac{\partial}{\partial t}u &= (\epsilon\Delta+V)u,\\ &\overset{\text{def}}{=} Hu \end{aligned} \tag{1.5}$$

on $\mathbb{Z}^d \times [0, \infty)$. When $0 < \epsilon \ll 1$, it is well known from the works in [AFHS, AM, vDK, FMSS, FS, GB, GK, GMP] etc. that the upper bound in (1.4) is satisfied. This is customarily called Anderson localization (A.L.) after the physicist P. Anderson [An]. Since the potential is time independent: $V(j, t) = V(j)$, properties of time evolution can be deduced from the spectral properties of H, which we summarize below. For more details, see the Appendix.

Let $\sigma(H)$ be the spectrum of H. For H defined in (1.5),

$$\sigma(H) = [-2\epsilon d, 2\epsilon d] + \operatorname{supp} g, \ a.s. \tag{1.6}$$

(Recall the probability space defined in (1.3).) [CFKS, PF]. If $0 < \epsilon \ll 1$ and the probability measure satisfies (1.3), then almost surely the spectrum of H is (dense) pure point, $\sigma(H) = \sigma_{pp}$, with exponentially localized eigenfunctions: ϕ_j, $j \in \mathbb{Z}^d$.

Given $u(0) \in \ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^d)$, we decompose $u(0)$ as $u(0) = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}^d} a_j \phi_j$. So

$$u(t) = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}^d} a_j \phi_j e^{-i\omega_j t}, \tag{1.7}$$

where ω_j are the eigenvalues for the eigenfunctions ϕ_j. $u(t)$ is almost-periodic and verifies the upper bound in (1.4). So equation (1.5) has A.L.

Some motivations for studying equation (1.1).

Schrödinger equations are equations that describe physical systems, which typically correspond to a n-body problem. The linear equation in (1.5) is a 0^{th} order approximation, where the n-body interaction is lumped into the effective potential V. Quantum mechanically, $|u|^2$ is interpreted as particle density, so the nonlinear term in (1.1) can be interpreted as modelling particle-particle interaction. (The nonlinear term in (1.1) can be more general and of convolution type. It will not affect our construction below.) This is sometimes called the Hartree-Fock approximation (cf. [LL, O, Sh]) and is a first order approximation to the original n-body problem. This is our first motivation to study (1.1). Other physical motivations along this line appear in [FSW].

In particular, our method permits us to construct quasi-periodic solutions for the Landau-Lifschitz equations on nonlinear classical spin waves with a large random external magnetic field. Thus

$$\dot{S}_j = S_j \times [(\Delta S)_j + h_j] \qquad (j \in \mathbb{Z}^d)$$

where S_j are unit vectors in $\mathbb{R}^3$ and $h_j = V_j \vec{e}_3$ say; with $V = (V_j)_{j \in \mathbb{Z}^d}$ a large random potential.

As explained in [FSW], we may then seek for a solution $S_j \approx e_3$ and the perturbation is subject to an equation of the form (1.1), but with a nearest neighbor convolution nonlinearity instead of the local one $|u|^{2p}u$ (see [FSW] for details). As mentioned before, (1.1) was chosen as a model but the method described in the paper is sufficiently robust to cover in particular any nonlinearity with finite range interactions.

Our second motivation originates from KAM type of stability questions for infinite dimensional dynamical systems. (For results in the standard KAM context, see e. g. [E].) (1.1) is a Hamiltonian PDE. It can be recast as the equation of motion corresponding to a Hamiltonian of a perturbed $\mathbb{Z}^d$-system of coupled harmonic oscillators with i.i.d. random frequencies (see (2.2, 2.3)). When $\delta = 0$, the linear system has pure point spectrum: $\sigma(H) = \sigma_{pp}$. This corresponds to the KAM tori scenario. A natural question is the stability of such invariant tori under small ($0 < \delta \ll 1$) perturbations, which leads to construction of quasi-periodic or almost periodic solutions to (1.1).

Remark. Previously in [AF, AFS], solutions to the nonlinear eigenvalue problem

$$(\epsilon\Delta + V)\phi + \delta|\phi|^{2p}\phi = E\phi \qquad \text{on} \quad \ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^d)$$

were found, which give the time periodic solutions to (1.1) of the particular form

$$u(j,t) = \phi(j)e^{-iEt}.$$

A sketch of the construction.

We expand in the Fourier basis: $e^{in\cdot\omega t}\delta_k(j)$ and as an ansatz, seek solutions of the form

$$u(\ell,t) = \sum_{(j,n)\in\mathbb{Z}^{d+\nu}} \hat{u}(j,n)e^{in\cdot\omega t}\delta_j(\ell), \tag{1.8}$$

with the initial condition

$$u(\ell,0) = \sum_{k=1}^{\nu} a_k\delta_k(\ell), \quad \text{satisfying} \sum_{k=1}^{\nu}|a_k| \ll 1, \tag{1.9}$$

where in (1.9), we identify $\{j_k\}_{k=1}^{\nu}$ with $\{1,...,\nu\}$, δ_k with δ_{j_k} ($k = 1,...,\nu$). The unperturbed frequencies are therefore $\omega = \omega(\mathcal{V}) = \mathcal{V} \in \mathbb{R}^\nu$, where $\mathcal{V} \overset{\text{def}}{=} \{v_{j_k}\}_{k=1}^{\nu}$ are the random potentials at sites $j_k \in \mathbb{Z}^d$.

Substituting (1.8) into (1.1), we obtain the following equation for the Fourier coefficients:

$$(n\cdot\omega + \epsilon\Delta_j + V_j)\hat{u}(j,n) + \delta[(\hat{u} * \hat{v})^{*p} * \hat{u}](j,n) = 0, \tag{1.10}$$

where $\hat{v}(j,n) = \bar{\hat{u}}(j,-n)$, the convolution $*$ is in the n variable only, $*p$ denotes the p-fold convolution and we added the subscript j to operators that originated from $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^d)$. We also write the equation for $\hat{v}$:

$$(-n\cdot\omega + \epsilon\Delta_j + V_j)\hat{v}(j,n) + \delta[(\hat{u} * \hat{v})^{*p} * \hat{v}](j,n) = 0. \tag{1.11}$$

Combining (1.10, 1.11), we then have a closed system of equations for $y = \begin{pmatrix} \hat{u} \\ \hat{v} \end{pmatrix}$, which we write as

$$F(y) = 0. \tag{1.12}$$

Equation (1.12) is a $\mathbb{Z}^{d+\nu}$ system of equations. Let $y_0 = y(t = 0)$.

$$\text{supp } y_0 = \{j_k, \, -e_k\}_{k=1}^{\nu} \cup \{j_k, \, e_k\}_{k=1}^{\nu}, \tag{1.13}$$

where e_k are the unit vectors of $\mathbb{Z}^{\nu}$. We seek solutions to (1.12) with y fixed at the initial condition on supp y_0, i.e., $\hat{u}(j_k, -e_k) = a_k$, $\hat{v}(j_k, e_k) = \bar{a}_k$, $k = 1, ..., \nu$, cf. (2.8). We make a Lyapunov-Schmidt decomposition as in [B1,3, CW1,2]. Let $y_0 = y(t = 0)$. The equations

$$F(y) = 0|_{\mathbb{Z}^{d+\nu} \backslash \text{supp}\, y_0} \qquad \text{on} \quad \ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^{d+\nu} \backslash \text{supp}\, y_0)$$

are the so called P-equations, the rest are the Q-equations. The P-equations are used to determine $y(j, n)$ on $\{\text{supp}\, y_0\}^c$. On supp y_0, $y(j, n)$ are held fixed at the initial condition from (1.9). Instead the ν Q-equations determine $\omega = \omega(\mathcal{V})$.

We use a Newton scheme to solve the P-equations (for more details, see section 3). This leads to investigate the invertibility of the linearized operators $F_i'(y_i)$, where y_i is the i^{th} approximate solution, F_i' is F' restricted to $[-M^{i+1}, M^{i+1}]^{d+\nu}$ $(i \geq 0)$ for appropriate M.

The random potentials $\mathcal{V} = \{v_{j_k}\}_{k=1}^{\nu} \in \mathbb{R}^{\nu}$ are the parameters in the problem. Invertibility of $F_i'(y_i)$ are assured by appropriate incisions in the probability space $\mathbb{R}^{\nu}$. Similar to the linear case in [BW], this is done by using semi-algebraic set techniques to control the complexity of the sigular sets and Cartan type of theorem for analytic matrix valued functions to control the measure.

The main difference with the linear case in [BW] is that F_i' are evaluated at different y_i. But due to rapid convergence of the Newton scheme, made possible by estimates on $F_{i'}'(y_{i'})$ for $i' < i$, this is within the margin of estimates.

Solving the P-equations iteratively is the main part of the work. The solutions to the P-equations are then substituted into the Q-equations to determine $\omega = \omega(\mathcal{V})$ iteratively by using the implicit function theorem. We obtain time quasi-periodic solutions of the form (1.8) to (1.1), which are exponentially localized (both in the spatial and Fourier space) to the initial condition (1.9), with modified frequencies $\omega = \omega(\mathcal{V})$, which are $(\epsilon + \delta)$-close to the unperturbed frequencies $\mathcal{V} = \{v_{j_k}\}_{k=1}^{\nu}$.

We therefore have

Statement of the Theorem.

Theorem. *Consider the nonlinear random Schrödinger equation*

$$i\frac{\partial}{\partial t}u = (\epsilon\Delta + V)u + \delta|u|^{2p}u, \qquad (p \in \mathbb{N}^+), \tag{1.14}$$

where Δ *is the discrete Laplacian defined in (1.2),* $V = \{v_j\}_{j\in\mathbb{Z}^d}$ *is a family of i.i.d. random variables with common distribution* g *satisfying (1.3). Fix* $j_k \in \mathbb{Z}^d$*,* $k = 1, \cdots, \nu$*. Let* $\mathcal{R} = \{j_k\}_{k=1}^{\nu} \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$*,* $\mathcal{V} = \{v_\alpha\}_{\alpha\in\mathcal{R}} \in \mathbb{R}^\nu$*. Consider an unperturbed solution of (1.14) with* ϵ*,* $\delta = 0$*,*

$$u_0(y,t) = \sum_{k=1}^{\nu} a_k e^{-iv_{j_k}t}\delta_{j_k}(y),$$

with $\sum_{k=1}^{\nu}|a_k|$ *sufficiently small. Let* $a = \{a_k\}_{k=1}^{\nu}$*.*

For $0 < \epsilon \ll 1$*,* $\exists X_\epsilon \subset \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{Z}^d}\backslash\mathbb{R}^\nu$ *of positive probability, such that for* $0 < \delta \ll 1$*,if we fix* $x \in X_\epsilon$*, there exists* $\mathcal{G}_{\epsilon,\delta}(x;a) \subset \mathbb{R}^\nu$*, Cantor set of positive measure. There is* $\omega = \omega_{\epsilon,\delta}(\mathcal{V};a)$ *smooth function defined on* $\mathcal{G}_{\epsilon,\delta}(x;a)$*, such that if* $\mathcal{V} \in \mathcal{G}_{\epsilon,\delta}(x;a)$*, then*

$$u_{\epsilon,\delta,x}(y,t) = \sum_{(j,n)\in\mathbb{Z}^{d+\nu}} \hat{u}(j,n)e^{in\cdot\omega t}\delta_j(y) \tag{1.15}$$

is a solution to (1.14), satisfying

$$\begin{aligned}
&\hat{u}(j_k, -e_k) = a_k, \quad k = 1, ..., \nu, \\
&\sum_{(j,n)\notin\mathcal{S}} e^{c(|n|+|j|)}|\hat{u}(j,n)| < \sqrt{\epsilon+\delta}, \\
&|\omega - \mathcal{V}| < c(\epsilon+\delta),
\end{aligned} \tag{1.16}$$

for some $c > 0$*, and where* $\{e_k\}_{k=1}^{\nu}$ *are the basis vectors for* $\mathbb{Z}^\nu$ *and* $\mathcal{S} = \{j_k, -e_k\}_{k=1}^{\nu} \subset \mathbb{Z}^{d+\nu}$*. The sets* X_ϵ *and* $\mathcal{G}_{\epsilon,\delta}(x;a)$ *satisfy*

$$\textit{Prob } X_\epsilon \to 1, \quad \textit{mes } \mathbb{R}^\nu\backslash\mathcal{G}_{\epsilon,\delta}(x;a) \to 0 \quad \textit{as} \quad \epsilon+\delta \to 0.$$

Remark. The set $X_\epsilon \subset \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{Z}^d}\backslash\mathbb{R}^\nu$ only depends on ϵ; while the set $\mathcal{G}_{\epsilon,\delta}(x;a) \subset \mathbb{R}^\nu$ depends on ϵ, δ, $x \in X_\epsilon$ (the random potentials in X_ϵ) and a (the initial amplitude).

Corollary. *There exists* $X_{\epsilon,\delta} \subset \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{Z}^d}$ *of positive probability,* $0 < \epsilon \ll 1$*,* $0 < \delta \ll 1$*, satisfying*

$$\textit{Prob } X_{\epsilon,\delta} \to 1 \quad \textit{as} \quad \epsilon + \delta \to 0,$$

such that for initial amplitudes a sufficiently small, there are quasi-periodic solutions to (1.14).

Comments on the family of parameters $\{v_j\}_{j\in\mathbb{Z}^d}$*.*

In solving (1.14), we use the basis $e^{in\cdot\omega t}\delta_j$, $(j, n) \in \mathbb{Z}^{d+\nu}$, (cf. (1.8)). In the $\mathbb{Z}^d$ basis δ_j ($j \in \mathbb{Z}^d$), the linear operator $H = \epsilon\Delta + V$ is *not* diagonalized. Hence $\{v_j\}_{j\in\mathbb{Z}^d}$ is *not* a family of independent parameters. This is a slight variation from the "usual" scenario, where the linear operator is diagonalized and the parameters are independent, which is the case in e.g., [B3].

Here it is convenient to work with the $\mathbb{Z}^d$ basis δ_j instead of the basis provided by the eigenfunctions ψ_j of H, as ψ_j depends on $\{v_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{Z}^d}$. More precisely, as $\{v_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{Z}^d\setminus\mathcal{R}}$ is held fixed on the appropriate probability subspace, ψ_j depends on $\{v_{k'}\}_{k'\in\mathcal{R}}$, which serve as parameters for the construction and are therefore varying, (see the statement of the Theorem).

From the KAM perspective, the normal frequencies are provided by the eigenvalues μ_j of H. Since $\{v_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{Z}^d\setminus\mathcal{R}}$ is fixed, the strong localization property (A8) of ψ_j implies that the normal frequencies μ_j for $|j| > \rho$, where ρ only depends on the radius of $\mathcal{R}$, can in fact be held fixed. This is close to the usual terrain, where the normal frequencies are fixed, while the tangential frequencies vary to avoid small divisors, either via the parameters or via amplitude-frequency modulation (cf. [B3, KP]).

An insertion into a larger picture.

The Theorem presented above is proven for i.i.d. random potentials $V = \{v_j\}_{j\in\mathbb{Z}^d}$. The construction used to prove the theorem is, however general. The essential ingredient is a *spectral separation property* on the linearized operator $\tilde{H}$: $\tilde{H} = n \cdot \omega + H$, where ω are the tangential frequencies, H is the original linear operator (corresponding to the quadratic part of the Hamiltonian, cf. (2.2)). In the present case, $H = \epsilon\Delta + V$. Assume H has pure point spectrum and we look at initial conditions localized about the origin. Below is a tentative formulation of this spectral property.

Let μ_j be the eigenvalues of H. Let $i = (j, n)$, $\lambda_i = n \cdot \omega + \mu_j$ be the eigenvalues of $\tilde{H}$. Let χ be an appropriate function, which depends essentially only on the initial condition, localized about the origin, $|\chi| \lesssim 1$. Let ϕ_i, ϕ_i' be eigenfunctions of $\tilde{H}$ (i.e., products of eigenfunctions of H and the exponentials). Define

$$K(i, i') = \int \phi_i \chi \phi_{i'}.$$

$\tilde{H}$ has *spectral separation property* if for each scale L, $\exists \ell \ll L$, such that

$$|\lambda_i - \lambda_{i'}| \gg K(i, i') \tag{1.17}$$

for $\ell \leq |i - i'| \leq L$ $(i \neq i')$. The μ_j, λ_i, ϕ_i can be replaced by their local version whenever appropriate.

In the present case, $H = \epsilon\Delta + V$, we use the local version. Assume ϵ is small so that H has A.L. (1.17) is provided by using (A5-7) and restricting to the appropriate probability subspace, (2.10) and a direct incision in the frequency space. Related spectral separation properties seem to hold in [B3, W]. (Compare (1.17) with the nondegeneracy condition in [KP, p164], where eigenfunctions do not seem to play an explicit role.)

Remark. For the random Schrödinger operator $H = \epsilon\Delta + V$ $(\epsilon \ll 1)$, no Diophantine property of the eigenvalues seems to be known at present. So a possible extension of the standard KAM method, as outlined in e.g., [FSW] is not feasible. It is known following [Mi] however, that the eigenvalue statistics is Poisson and that in a box of size N, the eigenvalue spacing is N^{-p} $(p \geq d)$. From general considerations, the spectrum of H, $\sigma(H)$ is simple [Si].

The construction of time quasi-periodic (or almost-periodic) solutions needs a parameter. This parameter can sometimes be extracted from amplitude-frequency modulation, see e.g., [KP]. Nonlinear random Schrödinger equation is an equation endowed with a family of parameters, where the separation property (1.17) can be obtained from A.L. of the linear operator. So it is a natural candidate for the construction of KAM type solutions.

The continuum Schrödinger equations (linear or nonlinear) are a more frequently studied subject. The discrete nonlinear Schrödinger equation presented here should be seen as the analogue of the continuum nonlinear Schrödinger equation in a compact domain, e.g., on a torus. The $\mathbb{Z}^d$ lattice therefore can be seen as the indices of the eigenvalues or eigenfunctions for the underlying linear Schrödinger operator.

Time quasi-periodic solutions have been constructed for the continuum nonlinear Schrödinger or wave equation in 1-D, on a finite interval with either Dirichlet or periodic boundary conditions. See for example, the works of Bourgain, Kuksin, Pöschel and Wayne in [B1, KP, Wy]. In [B3], time quasi-periodic solutions are constructed for the 2-D nonlinear Schrödinger equation on $\mathbb{T}^2$. In arbitrary dimension D, time quasi-periodic solutions for nonlinear Schrödinger and wave equations are treated in [B5, EK].

The construction presented here is related to those in [B1-5], which use a Newton scheme directly on the equations. This direct approach is originated by Craig and Wayne in [CW1,2]. It has the advantage of not relying on the underlying Hamiltonian structure. The Hamiltonian structure does assure, however, the reality of the frequency ω during the iteration, (see section 2 and [B3]).

We end this section by remarking that the present method, as it stands, does not yet extend to the construction of almost-periodic solutions. This is because the linear equation that serves as the starting point of our perturbation is

$$i\frac{\partial}{\partial t}u = Vu,$$

and *not*

$$i\frac{\partial}{\partial t}u = (\epsilon\Delta + V)u.$$

In order to construct almost-periodic solutions, we will need more informations on the spectrum of the linear operator $H = \epsilon\Delta + V$.

In [B2], the construction of almost-periodic solutions for 1-D nonlinear Schrödinger and wave equations under Dirichlet boundary conditions was made possible by the precise knowledge of the spectrum of the linear operator and the fact that the perturbation is quartic (in the Hamiltonian). In the present case it is quadratic. In [B6], almost-periodic solutions for a 1-D nonlinear Schrödinger equation under periodic boundary conditions and realistic decay conditions were constructed. In particular this applies in the real analytic category. Almost-periodic solutions have also been constructed by Pöschel [Pö2] in the case of a nonlinear Schrödinger equation, where the nonlinearity is “nonlocal”.

PDE’s (such as (1.1)) typically correspond to the so called “short range” (but not finite range) case. In the “finite range” case, which typically corresponds to perturbation of integrable Hamiltonian systems, almost-periodic solutions have been constructed in e.g., [CP, FSW, Pö1] among others.

2. Hamiltonian representation and Lyapunov-Schmidt decomposition

Recall from section 1, the nonlinear random Schrödinger equation

$$i\frac{\partial}{\partial t}u = (\epsilon\Delta + V)u + \delta|u|^{2p}u \qquad (p \in \mathbb{N}^+), \tag{2.1}$$

where $0 < \epsilon, \delta \ll 1$, Δ is the discrete Laplacian as defined in (1.2), $V = \{v_j\}_{j\in\mathbb{Z}^d}$ are i.i.d. random variables with common distribution g as in (1.3). The solutions $u = \{u(j,t)\}_{j\in\mathbb{Z}^d, t\in[0,\infty)}$.

Equation (2.1) can be recast as (infinite dimensional) Hamiltonian equations of motion, with canonical variables $(u, \bar{u})$ and the Hamiltonian

$$\begin{aligned} H(u,\bar{u}) &= \frac{1}{2}\Big[\sum_{j,j'\in\mathbb{Z}^d\times\mathbb{Z}^d}(\epsilon\Delta + V)_{jj'}u_j\bar{u}_{j'} + \left(\frac{\delta}{p+1}\right)\sum_j u_j^{p+1}\bar{u}_j^{p+1}\Big] \\ &\overset{\text{def}}{=} H_0(u,\bar{u}) + \delta H_1(u,\bar{u}). \end{aligned} \tag{2.2}$$

Equation (2.1) can then be written as

$$i\dot{u} = 2\frac{\partial H}{\partial \bar{u}}. \tag{2.3}$$

Remark. The connection with the usual canonical variables (p, q) is $u = p + iq, \bar{u} = p - iq$. The equation of motion in the (p, q) coordinates is

$$\dot{p} = \frac{\partial H}{\partial q}, \dot{q} = -\frac{\partial H}{\partial p},$$

which can be rewritten as a single equation (2.3). (This also explains the factors i and 2.)

Equations (2.2, 2.3) show that (2.1) can be viewed as a perturbed $\mathbb{Z}^d$-system of coupled harmonic oscillators with i.i.d. random frequencies. The perturbation H_1 can be of a more general type, e.g.,

$$H_1(u, \bar{u}) = \sum_{j,j' \in \mathbb{Z}^d \times \mathbb{Z}^d} a_{jj'} u_j^{p+1} \bar{u}_{j'}^{p+1} \tag{2.4}$$

with $a_{jj'} = a_{j'j}$ decaying exponentially or polynomially of sufficiently high degree as $|j - j'| \to \infty$. The reason we mention (2.4) is to stress that the construction we present below *does not* rely on integrability of the system. It also carries through for H_1 of type (2.4), although we only present it for $a_{jj'} = \delta_{jj'}$.

The goal of the rest of the paper is to seek time quasi-periodic solutions to (2.1) for appropriately chosen *localized* initial conditions. We hence expand u in the basis

$$e^{in\cdot\omega t}\delta_k(j), \tag{2.5}$$

where $n \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu, \omega \in \mathbb{R}^\nu$, $k, j \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, $\delta_k(j)$ is the canonical basis for $\mathbb{Z}^d$. $\delta_k(j)$ is a natural basis here due to smallness of ϵ. (In [B1-3], the spatial basis is given by the eigenfunctions of the linear operator. The k-labeling there is the eigenvalue labeling.)

In the basis (2.5), (2.1) becomes

$$(n \cdot \omega + \epsilon\Delta_j + V_j)\hat{u}(j, n) + \delta\widehat{\frac{\partial H_1}{\partial \bar{u}}}(j, n) = 0, \tag{2.6}$$

where $n \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu, j \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, H_1 as defined in (2.2) and $\hat{u}$ are the Fourier coefficients of u:

$$u(k, t) = \sum_{(j,n)} \hat{u}(j, n)e^{in\cdot\omega t}\delta_j(k). \tag{2.7}$$

We have also put the subscript j on operators that operate in the spatial ($\mathbb{Z}^d$) variable only. (This is the same notation as in [BW].)

In view of the Theorem, we seek solutions to (2.6) with the constraint

$$\hat{u}(j_k, -e_k) = a_k \qquad (k = 1, \dots \nu), \tag{2.8}$$

where $j_k \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, e_k are unit vectors in $\mathbb{Z}^\nu$, a_k are fixed. Assume $\omega_1, \omega_2, ..., \omega_\nu$ are rationally independent, i.e., $\omega = \{\omega_i\}_{i=1}^{\nu} \in \mathbb{R}^\nu$ is a Diophantine vector, which will be the case when the Theorem applies. A time shift and a limiting argument (since the Kronecker flow is dense) permit us to assume a_k are real. Hence from now on $a_k \in \mathbb{R}$, $k = 1, ..., \nu$.

Due to the smallness of ϵ, we take our initial unperturbed linear equation to be

$$i\frac{\partial}{\partial t}u = Vu. \tag{2.9}$$

The conditions in (2.8) thus correspond to the initial unperturbed solution

$$u_0(k,t) = \sum_{\ell=1}^{\nu} a_\ell e^{-iv_{j_\ell}t}\delta_{j_\ell}(k). \tag{2.10}$$

Let

$$a = \{a_k\}_{k=1}^{\nu} \in \mathbb{R}^\nu, \quad \mathcal{R} = \{j_k\}_{k=1}^{\nu} \subset \mathbb{Z}^d, \quad \mathcal{V} = \{v_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in \mathcal{R}} \in \mathbb{R}^\nu.$$

We constructively show that for ϵ small enough, $\exists X_\epsilon \subset \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{Z}^d} \backslash \mathbb{R}^\nu$ of positive probability, satisfying $\text{Prob}\, X_\epsilon \to 1$, as $\epsilon \to 0$, such that if we fix $x \in X_\epsilon$, for δ, a small enough, there exists $\mathcal{G}_{\epsilon,\delta}(x;a) \subset \mathbb{R}^\nu$, Cantor set of positive measure, satisfying $\text{mes}\, \mathbb{R}^\nu \backslash \mathcal{G}_{\epsilon,\delta}(x;a) \to 0$, as $\epsilon + \delta \to 0$. We can find $\omega = \omega(\mathcal{V};a)$, smooth function defined on $\mathcal{G}_{\epsilon,\delta}(x;a)$ and $\hat{u}$ such that (2.6) holds. ω and $\hat{u}$ are determined simultaneously in an iterative way.

Toward that end, we first perform a Lyapunov-Schmidt type decomposition (see [B1-3, CW1,2]) of (2.6). Let

$$\mathcal{S} = \{(j_k, -e_k) | k = 1, \dots \nu\} \subset \mathbb{Z}^{d+\nu}. \tag{2.11}$$

From (2.10), $\mathcal{S} = \text{supp}\ u_0$, u_0 is a solution to (1.14) when $\epsilon = \delta = 0$. We call $\mathcal{S}$ the resonant set and consider the ν equations

$$\begin{aligned}[(n \cdot \omega + \epsilon\Delta_j + V_j)\hat{u}](j_k, -e_k) + \delta\, \frac{\widehat{\partial H_1}}{\partial \bar{u}} \quad & (j_k, -e_k) = 0 \\ & (k = 1, \dots, \nu)\end{aligned} \tag{2.12}$$

obtained by taking $(j, n) \in \mathcal{S}$.

They form the finite system of Q-equations. The remaining infinite system of equations are called the P-equations

$$(n\cdot\omega+\epsilon\Delta_j+V_j)\hat{u}(j,n)+\delta\ \widehat{\frac{\partial H_1}{\partial\bar{u}}}(j,n)=0,\quad (j,n)\notin\mathcal{S}. \tag{2.13}$$

The P-equations are used to determine $\hat{u}(j,n)$ for $(j,n)\notin\mathcal{S}$. (Recall from (2.8) that $\{\hat{u}(j,n),(j,n)\in\mathcal{S}\}=a$ are given.)

Once $\hat{u}(j,n)$ are determined, the Q-equations in (2.12) are used to determine $\omega=\omega(\mathcal{V},a)$ via the implicit function theorem. Since a is real, H_1 is a polynomial in $u,\bar{u}$ with real coefficients, the solution $\hat{u}$ to (2.13) will be real and hence also ω determined from (2.12). (For more details, see the comment after (2.3) of [B3].)

To solve (2.13), we duplicate the equation for $\bar{u}$ to form a closed system. Let

$$\begin{aligned} v&=\bar{u}\\ \hat{v}(j,n)&=\bar{\hat{u}}(j,-n)\\ -\mathcal{S}&=\{(j_k,+e_k)|k=1,\dots\nu\}\subset\mathbb{Z}^{d+\nu}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.14}$$

(The flip in sign in the second equation of (2.14) is solely in order that the convolution coming from the nonlinearity obeys the usual sign convention.)

We then have the closed system of P-equations

$$\begin{cases} (n\cdot\omega+\epsilon\Delta_j+V_j)\hat{u}(j,n)+\delta\ \widehat{\frac{\partial H_1}{\partial v}}\ (j,n)=0, & (j,n)\notin\mathcal{S},\\ (-n\cdot\omega+\epsilon\Delta_j+V_j)\hat{v}(j,n)+\delta\ \widehat{\frac{\partial H_1}{\partial u}}\ (j,n)=0, & (j,n)\notin-\mathcal{S}. \end{cases} \tag{2.15}$$

For H_1 as in (2.2), (2.15) takes the explicit form

$$\begin{cases} [(n\cdot\omega+\epsilon\Delta_j+V_j)\hat{u}](j,n)+\delta[(\hat{u}*\hat{v})^{*p}*\hat{u}](j,n)=0,\\ [(-n\cdot\omega+\epsilon\Delta_j+V_j)\hat{v}](j,n)+\delta[(\hat{u}*\hat{v})^{*p}*\hat{v}](j,n)=0, \end{cases}\quad (j,n)\in\mathbb{Z}^{d+\nu}\backslash(\mathcal{S}\cup-\mathcal{S}) \tag{2.16}$$

where the convolution $*$ is in the n variable only. We solve (2.16) by using a Newton iteration scheme to be amplified in the next section. We also identify $\hat{u}$ with u, $\bar{\hat{u}}$ with v and write y for $\begin{pmatrix}\hat{u}\\ \hat{v}\end{pmatrix}$.

3. Newton scheme

Let F denote the left hand side (LHS) of (2.16). Our task is to restrict the set of $(\omega,\mathcal{V})\in\mathbb{R}^{2\nu}$ in order to find y such that

$$F(y)=0, \tag{3.1}$$

so that (2.16) is resolved. We use a Newton iteration. Recall first the formal scheme.

Starting from the initial approximant y_0, solution to (1.14) and its conjugate when $\epsilon = \delta = 0$, the successive approximants y_i are defined by

$$\Delta_{i+1}y \overset{\text{def}}{=} y_{i+1} - y_i = -[F'(y_i)]^{-1}F(y_i). \tag{3.2}$$

Let T denote the linearized operator F'. From (2.16)

$$T = D + \delta S, \tag{3.3}$$

where D is diagonal (in the $n \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu$ variables)

$$\begin{aligned} D &= \begin{pmatrix} n\cdot\omega + \epsilon\Delta_j + V_j & 0 \\ 0 & -n\cdot\omega + \epsilon\Delta_j + V_j \end{pmatrix} \\ &\overset{\text{def}}{=} \begin{pmatrix} D_+ & 0 \\ 0 & D_- \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned} \tag{3.4}$$

and

$$S = S(u,v) = \begin{pmatrix} (p+1)(u*v)^{*p} & p(u*v)^{*p-1}*u*u \\ p(u*v)^{*p-1}*v*v & (p+1)(u*v)^{*p} \end{pmatrix} \quad (p \in \mathbb{N}^+) \tag{3.5}$$

evaluated along the previous approximant. We note that S is self-adjoint, although this does not play a role in our construction.

Denote by $\|\ \|$ the ℓ^2 norm of a vector or operator on $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^{d+\nu})$. Using (3.2), the error of the approximation at stage $(i+1)$ can be estimated

$$\begin{aligned} F(y_{i+1}) &= F(y_i) + F'(y_i)(y_{i+1} - y_i) \\ &\qquad + \mathcal{O}(\|y_{i+1} - y_i\|^2) \\ &= \mathcal{O}(\|y_{i+1} - y_i\|^2). \end{aligned} \tag{3.6}$$

So using (3.2)

$$\|F(y_{i+1})\| = \mathcal{O}(\|[F'(y_i)]^{-1}\|^2)\|F(y_i)\|^2. \tag{3.7}$$

The crux of the matter is thus to control $\|[F'(y_i)]^{-1}\|$ in order that

$$\|F(y_{i+1})\| \ll \|F(y_i)\|. \tag{3.8}$$

(Note the squaring of the norm of $F(y_i)$ in the RHS of (3.7), which makes this feasible.)

Since (3.1) represents an infinite system of equations and the initial condition (2.10) is localized in a compact region in $\mathbb{Z}^{d+\nu}$, to control the norm of $[F'(y_i)]^{-1}$ we implement the Newton scheme in a slightly modified way, gradually increasing the size of the system that we consider.

Let $M \in \mathbb{N}^+$, which can be assumed large in order that $[-M, M]^{d+\nu} \supset 2p \operatorname{supp} y_0$, in view of (3.4, 3.5) (See also (3.10) below.). At stage i, let $N = M^{i+1}$ and $T_N(y_i)$, the restriction of $T(y_i)$ to $[-N, N]^{d+\nu}$. We define

$$\Delta_{i+1} y = y_{i+1} - y_i \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} -\big(T_N(y_i)\big)^{-1} F(y_i). \tag{3.9}$$

So

$$\begin{aligned} F(y_{i+1}) &= F(y_i) + F'(y_i)(y_{i+1} - y_i) + \mathcal{O}(\|y_{i+1} - y_i\|^2) \\ &= (T - T_N)(y_{i+1} - y_i) + \mathcal{O}(\|y_{i+1} - y_i\|^2) \\ &= -[(T - T_N)T_N^{-1}]F(y_i) + \mathcal{O}(\|T_N^{-1}\|^2 \|F(y_i)\|^2), \end{aligned} \tag{3.10}$$

where we used (3.9). Compared to (3.6) the first term in the RHS of (3.10) is new. Moreover it is only *linear* in $F(y_i)$. This necessitates the control of off-diagonal decay of T and T_N^{-1} evaluated at y_i, in addition to that of $\|T_N^{-1}\|$.

The control of T_N^{-1}

Recall that the 0^{th} approximant (initial condition) to (3.1) y_0 has compact support, $\operatorname{supp} y_0 = \mathcal{S} \cup -\mathcal{S}$, where $\mathcal{S}$ and $-\mathcal{S}$ are defined in (2.11, 2.14). From (3.3-3.5), $T(y_0)$ is a diagonal dominated matrix with finite range off-diagonal elements. So off-diagonal decay of $T(y_0)$ is automatically satisfied.

Assume the successive approximants y_i are *uniformly* (in i) exponentially localized about $\mathcal{S} \cup -\mathcal{S}$ (cf. (1.16)). This assumption will be verified later from the construction itself in view of (3.9, 3.10). From (3.5) the successive $S(y_i)$ have *uniformly* exponentially decaying off-diagonal elements in the n direction, and are diagonal in the j direction, with a prefactor which decays exponentially in j. (The exponential decay of the prefactor stems from the uniform exponential decay assumption on y_i.) Hence $T(y_i)$ are of the type (although more complicated) of matrix operator studied in [BW].

To study the T's, we introduce, as in [BW] an auxiliary parameter $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$. We consider instead

$$T^\theta = D^\theta + \delta S, \tag{3.11}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} D^\theta &= \begin{pmatrix} n \cdot \omega + \theta + \epsilon \Delta_j + V_j & 0 \\ 0 & -(n \cdot \omega + \theta) + \epsilon \Delta_j + V_j \end{pmatrix} \\ &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \begin{pmatrix} D_+^\theta & 0 \\ 0 & D_-^\theta \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned} \tag{3.12}$$

and S is as before in (3.5). Similarly we define $T_N^\theta(y_i)$, where $N = M^{i+1}$ as in (3.9).

In section 4, fix x in a good set of probability space, where there is Anderson localization for the linear random Schrödinger operator $H_j = \epsilon\Delta_j + V_j$, so that (A6) holds. (For precise details see the appendix.) Assuming ω Diophantine, y_i uniformly (in i) exponentially localized about $\mathcal{S} \cup -\mathcal{S}$, we bound the norm of $[T_N^\theta(y_{i'})]^{-1}$, where $N = M^i$, $i' > i$ as in (4.9) (The precise relation between i and i' is dictated by the construction in section 5.) and establish exponential decay properties of its off-diagonal matrix elements on a set of θ of small complementary measure.

In Lemma 4.1, fix any y_k, we bound $[T_N^\theta(y_k)]^{-1}$ for all N. We then use it to obtain estimates on $[T_N^\theta(y_{i'})]^{-1}$, where $N = M^i$, $i' > i$ satisfying the restriction in the third line of (4.9). This bound is abstract in the sense that ω, $\mathcal{V}$, $y_{i'}$ are viewed as *independent* parameters for the time being.

As in [BW], this is an iteration process, using semi-algebraic set techniques and Cartan-type theorem. To start the iteration, we neglect δS and exclude a set of θ such that $D_N^\theta = D_M^\theta$ has a small diagonal element. To continue the iteration, we also need to exclude a set in ω of small measure. It is important to remark that this set in ω is *independent* of $\mathcal{V}$, y_k. It only depends on $x \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{Z}^d} \backslash \mathbb{R}^\nu$. We stress that for fixed x in the good probability set, Lemma 4.1 holds for *any* fixed ω in the good frequency set, *any* $\mathcal{V} \in \mathbb{R}^\nu$ and *any* y_k which satisfy (H1-3) in section 4. The set of excluded θ, $\mathcal{B}(N)$ depends, of course, on x, ω, $\mathcal{V}$, y_k.

In section 5, we iteratively transfer the estimates on $T_N^\theta(y_{i'})$ in θ into estimates on $T_{\bar{N}}(y_{\bar{i}})$ in $(\omega, \mathcal{V})$, where $N = M^{i+1}$, $\bar{N} = M^{\bar{i}+1}$, $\bar{i} > i' > i$ to be made precise, using the resolvent equation and taking into account the Q-equations, which are implicit functions relating ω, $\mathcal{V}$, y_i. (Recall that θ is an auxiliary variable. In the original problem (3.3), θ is fixed at 0.) x is fixed in the good set of probability space as in section 4.

For the first i iterations, we treat δS as perturbation and use a direct ϵ, δ perturbation series. Instead of excluding a set of θ as in section 4, we exclude a set of $(\omega, \mathcal{V}) \in \mathbb{R}^{2\nu}$, so that in the complement, $T_N(y_i)$ are invertible with exponentially decaying off-diagonal elements.

This generates an initial set of "good" intervals: $\mathbb{R}^{2\nu} \supset \Lambda_1 \supset \Lambda_2 \supset \cdots \supset \Lambda_i$ in the $(\omega, \mathcal{V})$-space. Using the Newton scheme in (3.9), this also shows that y_0, y_1, $\cdots$, y_i are exponentially localized about $\mathcal{S} \cup -\mathcal{S}$. (Recall that y_0 is the initial condition, $\operatorname{supp} y_0 = \mathcal{S} \cup -\mathcal{S}$.)

Starting from the $(i+1)^{th}$ iteration, aside from direct δ perturbation series, for certain parts of the estimates, (which concerns the regions far from the origin in the $\mathbb{Z}^d$ direction), we need to keep δS. This is the heart of the matter. In technical terms, we need to deal with more general semi-algebraic sets, which are not solely defined by products of monomials. For such semi-algebraic sets, we use Q-equations and a decomposition lemma (Lemma 9.9 in [B5], restated as Lemma 5.3 in section 5) to transfer the measure estimates in θ in Lemma 4.1 into measure estimates in

$\omega = \omega(\mathcal{V}) \in \mathbb{R}^\nu$. Using perturbation, this in turn generates a new set of intervals $\Lambda_{i+1} \subset \Lambda_i \subset \cdots \subset \mathbb{R}^{2\nu}$, in the $(\omega, \mathcal{V})$ space, on which $T_{M^{i+1}}(y_i)$ is invertible and whose inverse has uniformly (in i) exponentially decaying off-diagonal elements.

In section 6, using the Newton scheme (3.9), we construct y_{i+1}. The (uniformly in i) exponential localization about $\mathcal{S} \cup -\mathcal{S}$ is preserved. Hence Lemma 4.1 is now available at $y_k = y_{i+1}$ for future iterations. We generate Λ_{i+2}, y_{i+2}...

Section 7 summarizes the entire construction. It is merely meant as a recapitulation of the sequence of events leading to the theorem.

Two technical subtleties

- The estimates in section 4 are obtained along the construction devised in [BW]. However for the application to (4.9), $T_N^\theta(y_{i'})$ need to be evaluated at different $y_{i'}$ at different scales N. Due to the *uniform* exponential decay estimates on $y_{i'}$, Lemma 4.1 can be applied as explained after the statement of Lemma 4.1.
- From the P-equations, the y_i's are constructed on a *good* set of $(\omega, \mathcal{V}) \in \mathbb{R}^{2\nu}$. (This set eventually becomes a Cantor set.) On the same set of $(\omega, \mathcal{V})$ we also have estimates on ∂y_i, where ∂ is with respect to ω or $\mathcal{V}$. Using this, we can construct y_i which is smoothly defined on the whole parameter space $(\omega, \mathcal{V})$. (Note that outside the good set in $(\omega, \mathcal{V})$, y_i is no longer close to a solution to $F(y_i) = 0$.) Substituting for y_i, the Q-equations are therefore defined on the whole parameter space $(\omega, \mathcal{V})$. We can then use the standard implicit function theorem to determine $\omega = \omega(\mathcal{V})$.

4. P-equations and statement in θ

Recall the system of P-equations in (2.16)

$$\begin{cases} (n \cdot \omega + \epsilon\Delta_j + V_j)\hat{u} + \delta(\hat{u} * \hat{v})^{*p} * \hat{u} = 0 \\ (-n \cdot \omega + \epsilon\Delta_j + V_j)\hat{v} + \delta(\hat{u} * \hat{v})^{*p} * \hat{v} = 0 \end{cases} \tag{4.1}$$

on $\ell^2\big(\mathbb{Z}^{d+\nu} \backslash (\mathcal{S} \cup -\mathcal{S})\big)$, where $\mathcal{S}$, $-\mathcal{S}$ are as defined in (2.11, 2.14), which are collectively written as $F(y) = 0$, with $y = \begin{pmatrix} \hat{u} \\ \hat{v} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} u \\ v \end{pmatrix}$.

We solve (4.1) using a Newton scheme, with the family of linearized operators $T(y_i)$, evaluated at the i^{th} approximant y_i

$$T(y_i) = D + \delta S(y_i) \tag{4.2}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} D &= \begin{pmatrix} n \cdot \omega + \epsilon\Delta_j + V_j & 0 \\ 0 & -n \cdot \omega + \epsilon\Delta_j + V_j \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} D_+ & 0 \\ 0 & D_- \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned} \tag{4.3}$$

and

$$S(y_i) = \begin{pmatrix} (p+1)(u_i * v_i)^{*p} & p(u_i * v_i)^{*p-1} * u_i * u_i \\ p(u_i * v_i)^{*p-1} * v_i * v_i & (p+1)(u_i * v_i)^{*p} \end{pmatrix} \tag{4.4}$$

as in (3.4, 3.5).

In view of the Newton scheme in (3.9), we need to study the family of restricted operators: $T_N(y_i)$, $N = M^{i+1}$, M assumed large depending on p,

$$T_N(y_i) = R_N T(y_i) R_N \tag{4.5}$$

and R_N is the characteristic function of the set $[-N, N]^{d+\nu}$. This will be achieved in section 5 by using the resolvent identity, covering $[-M^{i+1}, M^{i+1}]^{d+\nu}$ with the interval $I = [-M^i, M^i]^{d+\nu}$ and smaller intervals $J = [-M_0, M_0]^{d+\nu} + k$, $\frac{1}{2}M^i < |k| < M^{i+1}$, $M_0 \sim (\log N)^{C/2}$, (4.6)

(see (5.5)), and restricting the set of $(\omega, \mathcal{V}) \in \mathbb{R}^{2\nu}$.

Toward that end, as previously mentioned in section 3, we introduce an additional parameter $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$ and let

$$D^\theta = \begin{pmatrix} D_+ + \theta & 0 \\ 0 & D_- - \theta \end{pmatrix},$$

$$T^\theta(y_i) = D^\theta + \delta S(y_i),$$

$$T^\theta_N(y_i) = R_N T^\theta(y_i) R_N \tag{4.7}$$

As mentioned there, we temporarily view ω, $\mathcal{V} \in \mathbb{R}^\nu$ as independent parameters in this section. In the same vein, we also dissociate y_i from ω, $\mathcal{V}$, assuming only that they satisfy (H1-3) below. It is only in section 5 that we restrict to $\omega = \omega(\mathcal{V})$, determined from the Q-equations and y_i, the i^{th} approximate solution to (4.1), which depends on ω, $\mathcal{V}$.

In the rest of the section $\omega, \mathcal{V}$ are held *fixed*, only θ is varying. Note that T^θ is of the form $T^\theta \overset{\text{def}}{=} T(\theta) = T'(\theta + n \cdot \omega)$. Later in section 5, we transfer the estimate in θ into estimates in ω, hence $\mathcal{V}$ by restricting θ to be of the form $\theta = n \cdot \omega$, thereby resolving (4.1), (which is at $\theta = 0$) on the good set of $\omega, \mathcal{V}$.

Newton scheme is an iterative scheme. The estimate on $[T_I(y_i)]^{-1}$ for I defined in (4.6) is easily obtained by perturbation arguments on $[T_I(y_{i-1})]^{-1}$ known from the previous step, which is the step to construct y_i, see (3.9). The main task is to estimate $[T_J(y_i)]^{-1}$ for J defined in (4.6). We therefore study $[T^\theta_{[-M_0,M_0]^{d+\nu}}(y_i)]^{-1}$ (and later in section 5, we restrict to $\theta = k \cdot \omega$, $\frac{1}{2}M^i < |k| < M^{i+1}$). This is the subject of Lemma 4.1and its application. Note that M_0 corresponds to the size of interval at a stage $[\log M_0/\log M]$, which procedes i, while the linearized operator T is evaluated at y_i: $T = T(y_i)$.

Assume y_i satisfies

(H1) supp $y_i \subseteq [-M^i, M^i]^{d+\nu} \qquad (i \geq 1)$.

(This is by construction, see (3.9).)

(H2') $\|\Delta_i y\| = \|y_i - y_{i-1}\| < \sqrt{\epsilon + \delta} M^{-b^i} \qquad (i \geq 1)$

for some $1 < b < 2$ in view of (3.6, 3.9) and b will be specified in (6.20). (Recall $y_0 = \begin{pmatrix} u_0 \\ v_0 \end{pmatrix}$, u_0 defined in (2.10), $v_0 = \bar{u}_0$.)

(H3) $|y_i(k)| < e^{-\alpha|k|}$ for some $\alpha > 0$ (uniform in i).

(There is no constant in front of the exponential, as we assume small initial data: $|a_\ell| < 1, \ell = 1, \dots \nu$. See (1.9).)

Remark. Using (3.6) in (3.9) $\|\Delta_i y\|^2 < \|\Delta_{i+1} y\| < \|\Delta_i y\|$, assuming appropriate condition on T_N^{-1}. This is consistent with $1 < b < 2$ in (H2').

(H1-3) will be verified along the iteration later in sections 5, 6 using Lemma 4.1 below.

Let $\Lambda_N = [-N, N]^d, X_N \subset \mathbb{R}^{\Lambda_N} \backslash \mathbb{R}^\nu$ be a set, where $\epsilon \Delta_j + V_j$ has A.L. at scale N, in a sense to be made explicit in the process of the proof, X_N is asymptotically ($\epsilon \to 0$) of full measure. (Recall also that $\mathcal{V} = \{v_{j_k}\}_{k=1}^\nu \in \mathbb{R}^\nu$ with measure $\prod_{k=1}^\nu g(v_{j_k}) dv_{j_k}$, is the parameter set.)

Definition

For A, $c > 0$, $DC_{A,c}(N) \subset \mathbb{R}^\nu$ is the set such that if $\omega \in DC_{A,c}(N)$, then

$$\|n \cdot \omega\|_{\mathbb{T}} \geq \frac{c}{|n|^A}, \ n \in [-N, N]^\nu \backslash \{0\}. \tag{4.8}$$

$DC_{A,c} \subset \mathbb{R}^\nu$ is the set of ω such that (4.8) is satisfied for all N.

$\mathcal{B}_{\beta,\gamma}(N) \subset \mathbb{R}$ is the complement of the set of $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$ defined by

$$\begin{aligned} &\|T_N^\theta(y_{i'})^{-1}\| < e^{N^\beta} \qquad (0 < \beta < 1), \\ &|[T_N^\theta(y_{i'})]^{-1}(k, k')| < e^{-\gamma|k-k'|} \qquad (\gamma > 0), \\ &\text{for } |k - k'| > N/10, N = M^{i+1}, i' \simeq \frac{\log M}{\log b} i > i \ (b \text{ as in (H2')}), \end{aligned} \tag{4.9}$$

$y_{i'}$ satisfies (H1-3); i' is chosen in view of later construction in Lemma 5.1, (see in particular (5.14, 5.15)). This means of course that at least the first $\mathcal{O}(\frac{\log M}{\log b})$ approximants are obtained by direct perturbation series in ϵ, δ. So $\alpha = \mathcal{O}(1)|\log(\epsilon + \delta)|$. In general we write $\mathcal{B}(N)$ for $\mathcal{B}_{\beta,\gamma}(N)$, unless the parameters β, γ need to be emphasized.

Remark. At this stage of the construction, it is sufficient to have a lower bound on b. This can be easily obtained in the first few perturbation series by adjusting ϵ, δ. For later purposes, we mention that the Diophantine condition (4.8) will be used for $\omega = \omega_{i'}$, the i'^{th} approximation.

The inequalities in (4.9) are proven iteratively as in [BW]. The rate of decay γ will deteriorate with iteration. So $\gamma = \gamma_N$. But the decrease will decrease with increasing scales and we have $\gamma_N > \gamma/2$ for all N, cf. Lemma 4.1 and the paragraph after. This rate of decay determines the rate of decay of y_i. So this is consistent with the assumption (H3).

Inspecting the definition of D_θ in (4.7, 4.3), θ is *not* equivalent to a spectral parameter. Hence we need to resort to Cartan-type theorems as in the wave case in [BW]. This necessitates that we obtain estimate (4.9) for more general regions than cubes at each scale N, the elementary regions to be defined below.

Remark. The various approximants y_i are still evaluated using cubes $[-N, N]^{d+\nu}$, $N = M^{i+1}$ as in (3.9). It is only at each scale N that we also look at restrictions of $T(y_{i'})$ ($i' \simeq \frac{\log M}{\log b} i$) to these more general regions.

Elementary Regions

An *elementary region* is a set Λ of the form

$$\Lambda \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} R \backslash (R + k),\ k \in \mathbb{Z}^{d+\nu} \text{ is arbitrary} \tag{4.10}$$

and R is a hyper-rectangle

$$\begin{aligned} R = \{\ell' \in \mathbb{Z}^{d+\nu} \,||\ell'_i - \ell_i| \leq N_i, i = 1, \ldots d,\ d+1, ..., d+\nu, \\ \ell' = \{\ell'_i\}_{i=1}^{\nu+d} \in \mathbb{Z}^{d+\nu}, \ell = \{\ell_i\}_{i=1}^{\nu+d} \in \mathbb{Z}^{d+\nu}\} \end{aligned} \tag{4.11}$$

Let $N = \max_i N_i \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} N_{i_{\max}}$. Assume $\ell \in \mathbb{Z}^{d+\nu}$ fixed. We call ℓ the center of R. $\mathcal{ER}(N)$ (at a fixed center) is then defined to be the set of all regions obtained by varying $k \in \mathbb{Z}^{d+\nu}$ and N_i ($i \neq i_{\max}$), keeping $N_i \leq N$. We say $2N$ is the diameter of the elementary regions.

To be economical, we extend the notation T_N to mean $T_{\Lambda(N)} = R_{\Lambda(N)} T R_{\Lambda(N)}$, for any $\Lambda(N) \in \mathcal{ER}(N)$ and where $R_{\Lambda(N)}$ is the characteristic function of the set $\Lambda(N)$; $\mathcal{B}(N)$ is then the corresponding bad set, on which (4.9) are violated. For the purpose of constructing approximate solutions, we only need to specialize to $N = M^{i+1}$, ($i \geq 0$). However to state the various intermediate technical lemmas, it is more convenient to let N be any integer.

Fix any y_k satisfying (H1-3). Let T_N be the linearized operator evaluated at y_k for all N, i.e., $T_N = T_N(y_k)$. With a slight abuse of notation, we also let $\mathcal{B}_{\beta,\gamma}(N)$ be the corresponding bad set. The main goal of this section is to prove

Lemma 4.1. *Fix* $0 < \sigma < \frac{1}{6(d+\nu)}$, $\sigma < \beta < 1$, $\bar{N}_0$ *sufficiently large,* $\max(\frac{1}{\sigma}, 6(d+\nu)) \ll C < \bar{N}_0^{\sigma/2}$. *There exist* $\epsilon_0 > 0$, $\delta_0 > 0$, *such that for all* $0 < \epsilon < \epsilon_0$, $0 < \delta < \delta_0$, *there exists* $X \subset \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{Z}^d} \backslash \mathbb{R}^\nu$ *with*

$$\operatorname{mes} X \geq 1 - \mathcal{O}(1)\bar{N}_0^{-\kappa}, \tag{4.12}$$

where $\kappa = \kappa(C, p', d) > 0$, p' *as in (A2). Fix* $x \in X$, $\exists \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^\nu$ *(independent of* $\mathcal{V} \in \mathbb{R}^\nu$, y_k*), with*

$$\operatorname{mes} \Omega \leq e^{-\bar{N}_0^{\kappa'}},$$

where $\kappa' = \kappa'(C, \beta) > 0$, *such that if*

$$\omega \in DC_{A,c} \backslash \Omega \tag{4.13}$$

then for any $\Lambda(N) \in \mathcal{ER}(N)$, $N \geq \bar{N}_0$

$$\operatorname{mes} \mathcal{B}_{\beta,\gamma_N}(N) \leq e^{-N^\sigma}. \tag{4.14}$$

where $\gamma_N \geq \alpha - \bar{N}_0^{-\delta'}$, $(\delta' > 0)$, *for all* N, α *as in (H3),* $\alpha = \mathcal{O}(1)|\log(\epsilon + \delta)|$.

Remark. $\mathcal{B}_{\beta,\gamma_N}(N)$ depends only on y_k, $\omega, \mathcal{V}$ as x is fixed. In the proof of Lemma 4.1, only (H3) on y_k is needed.

In order to obtain (4.9) at all scales, we apply Lemma 4.1 as follows. From the third line of (4.9), for any fixed y_k, we only need the lemma at scale $N = M^i$ with $i = \frac{\log b}{\log M} k$. To go to scale $N' = N^C = M^{iC}$ with the corresponding $y_{k'}$, $k' = \frac{\log M}{\log b} iC$, we first use (H2'), which gives that

$$\|T_N^\theta(y_k) - T_N^\theta(y_{k'})\| \leq \mathcal{O}_{d+\nu}(1)\|y_k - y_{k'}\| \leq \mathcal{O}_{d+\nu}(1) M^{-b^k}. \tag{4.15}$$

(4.15) shows that we have essentially the same estimate on $\|T_N^\theta(y_{k'})\|$ as for $\|T_N^\theta(y_k)\|$.

We use N as the initial scale instead of $\bar{N}_0$, the proof of the inductive step in Lemma 4.1 then gives instead

$$\gamma_{N'}(y_{k'}) = \gamma_N(y_k) - N^{-\delta'}, (\delta' > 0),\ N' = N^C. \tag{4.16}$$

From (3.9), the decay rate α_{i+1} of y_{i+1} is governed by the decay rate of $[T_N(y_i)]^{-1}$, where $N = M^{i+1}$. (Note that θ is fixed at 0.) This operator is treated in section 5 using several considerations including Lemma 4.1, (4.9), resolvent equation and semi-algebraic sets. The decay rate α_{i+1} depends on γ_{M_0}, where $M_0 \ll N = M^{i+1}$ is determined in (5.5), cf. also (6.1-6.8). So (4.16) prevents the deterioration of α_i as $i \to \infty$ and we will have $\alpha_i > \alpha/2$ for all i in section 6.

We prove Lemma 4.1 using iteration. The two pillars of this iteration are semi-algebraic set techniques and Cartan-type theorem for analytic matrix valued functions (see [B5, BGS]). The general construction of the iteration is the same as in our previous paper [BW].

The initial estimate (0^{th} *step)*

In view of (4.4) and the Newton scheme (3.9), choose $M > 2p$, such that

$$\mathcal{S} \cup -\mathcal{S} \subset [-M, M]^{d+\nu}. \tag{4.17}$$

Lemma 4.2. *Fix $0 < \sigma < \beta < 1$, there exists $M_0 = M_0(d+\nu, \sigma, \beta)$ such that for all $M \geq M_0$, there exist ϵ_0, δ_0 such that*

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|[T_M^\theta]^{-1}\| < e^{M^\beta} \qquad (0<\beta<1),\\
&|[T_M^\theta]^{-1}(\ell, \ell')| < e^{-\alpha|\ell-\ell'|} \qquad (\alpha \textit{ as in } (H3)),\\
&|\ell - \ell'| > M/10, M \geq M_0,
\end{aligned}$$

for $0 < \epsilon \leq \epsilon_0$, $0 < \delta \leq \delta_0$, $\theta \in \mathbb{R}\backslash\mathcal{B}_{\beta,\alpha}(M)$, mes $\mathcal{B}_{\beta,\alpha}(M) \leq e^{-M^\sigma}$, all $x \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{Z}^d}\backslash\mathbb{R}^\nu$, all $\omega \in [0,1)^\nu$. (Recall from (4.3-4.5) the x and ω dependence of $T_N^\theta(y_i')$.)

Proof. We use Neumann series in ϵ, δ to estimate T_M^{-1}. We require

$$\begin{cases} |\theta + n\cdot\omega + v_j| > 2\max(e^{-M^\beta}, (\epsilon+\delta)^{1/2}), \\ |-\theta - n\cdot\omega + v_j| > 2\max(e^{-M^\beta}, (\epsilon+\delta)^{1/2}), \end{cases} \forall (j,n) \in [-M,M]^{d+\nu}\backslash\{\mathcal{S}\cup -\mathcal{S}\}. \tag{4.18}$$

Clearly, (4.18) holds away from a set of $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$ of measure at most

$$4(2M+1)^{d+\nu}\max(e^{-M^\beta}, (\epsilon+\delta)^{1/2}). \tag{4.19}$$

Choose ϵ, δ such that $(\epsilon+\delta)^{1/2} \leq e^{-M^\beta}$, which can be satisfied if $0 < \epsilon \leq \epsilon_0$, $0 < \delta \leq \delta_0$ with $\epsilon_0 = \delta_0 = \frac{1}{2}e^{-2M^\beta}$. From (4.19), we need $4(2M+1)^{d+\nu}e^{-M^\beta} \leq e^{-M^\sigma}$ $(0 < \sigma < \beta < 1)$. This leads to $M \geq M_0(d+\nu, \sigma, \beta)$.

On the complement of the set defined in (4.18), using Neumann series in ϵ, δ for T_M^{-1} and (H3), we verify that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|[T_M^\theta]^{-1}\| < e^{M^\beta} \qquad (0<\beta<1),\\
&|[T_M^\theta]^{-1}(\ell, \ell')| < e^{-\alpha|\ell-\ell'|} \qquad (\alpha \text{ as in } (H3)),\\
&|\ell - \ell'| > M/10, M \geq M_0,
\end{aligned}$$

for $0 < \epsilon \leq \epsilon_0$, $0 < \delta \leq \delta_0$. The probability set at this scale X_M and the frequency set at this scale Ω_M, on which and on the complement of which (4.14) holds satisfy

$$\operatorname{mes} X_M = 1, \operatorname{mes} \Omega_M = 0 \tag{4.20}$$

$\square$

This direct perturbation argument is the same as in [BW]. Note that (4.20) entails that (4.14) holds for all ω, v_j, as in the 0^{th} step, the invertibility is entirely provided by shifting in θ. There is *no* bad site. We will only use the above lemma for the initial set of scales.

The iteration

We now prove Lemma 4.1 using iteration from scale N_0 to $N_0^C = N$. (C assumed large). We call an elementary region $\Lambda(N_0)$ *bad*, if the first 2 inequalities in (4.9) are violated. As in [BW], we need to perform an incision in the frequency space, in order that inside any $\Lambda(N) \in \mathcal{ER}(N)$, there are at most N^{1-} pair-wise disjoint bad elementary regions at scale N_0, where N^{1-} means N^a $(0 < a < 1)$. For technical reasons (cf. [BGS, BW]), this requirement pertains to all elementary regions $\Lambda(N')$, $N_0 \leq N' \leq 2N_0$ and not simply at $N' = N_0$. For later constructions in section 5, it is important to note once again that this set is independent of $\mathcal{V} = \{v_{j_k}\}_{k=1}^{\nu}$.

Let $\Lambda(N) \in \mathcal{ER}(N), \bar{\Lambda}(N)$ be its projection onto $\mathbb{Z}^d$;

$$\mathcal{T}(N) = \{[-N_0, N_0]^d \times [-N, N]^\nu\} \cap \Lambda(N), \tag{4.21}$$

$\bar{\mathcal{T}}(N)$ be its projection onto $\mathbb{Z}^d$. Denote by $\overline{\mathcal{ER}}(N)$ the projection of $\mathcal{ER}(N)$ onto $\mathbb{Z}^d$. Note that $\bar{\Lambda}(N) \in \overline{\mathcal{ER}}(N)$ can be of much smaller diameter than $2N$.

Number of bad elementary regions at scale N_0 disjoint from $\mathcal{T}(N)$.

Using (H3) in (4.2-4.4), the region $\Lambda(N)\backslash\mathcal{T}(N)$ can be treated perturbatively. We make separate incisions in the probability space and the frequency space. We first make incisions in the probability space. Toward that end, we look at

$$\Lambda(N') \in \mathcal{ER}(N'),\ \Lambda(N') \subset \Lambda(N),\ \Lambda(N') \cap \mathcal{T}(N) = \emptyset \quad (N_0 \leq N' \leq 2N_0). \tag{4.22}$$

Let

$$X'_N \subset \mathbb{R}^{\{\mathbb{Z}\backslash[-N_0,N_0]\}^d} \tag{4.23}$$

be the probability set such that there is at most **1** (pair-wise disjoint) $\bar{\Lambda}(N')$ $(N_0 \leq N' \leq 2N_0)$, satisfying :

$$\begin{cases} \bar{\Lambda}(N') \in \overline{\mathcal{ER}}(N'), \\ \bar{\Lambda}(N') \subset [-N, N]^d, \\ \bar{\Lambda}(N') \cap [-N_0, N_0]^d = \emptyset, \end{cases} \tag{4.24}$$

where $(A1)$ is violated for some $E \in I$, $I = \sigma(H)$, the set defined in (1.6).

Using Theorem A, with $m = \gamma$,

$$\begin{aligned}\operatorname{mes} X'_N &> \left(1 - \frac{1}{N_0^{2p'}}\right)^{\mathcal{O}(1)(N^d \times N_0^{d+1})^2} \\ &\geq 1 - \frac{\mathcal{O}(1)}{N^{\frac{2}{C}(p'-d(C+1)-1)}} \quad \big(p' > d(C+1)+1\big), \end{aligned}\tag{4.25}$$

where $\mathcal{O}(1)$ is a universal geometric constant; p' is to be determined at the conclusion of the proof of Lemma 4.1. We used $N = N_0^C$, the second factor N_0^{d+1} comes from the estimate on the number of elementary regions of sizes 1 to $2N_0$ associated to each lattice site: $\mathcal{O}(1)\sum_{N'_0=1}^{2N_0} N_0'^d$ $\big($cf. (4.11)$\big)$ the exponent is an upperbound on the number of pairs of elementary regions of sizes up to $2N_0$ in $\Lambda(N)$.

Given two elementary regions $\Lambda_1(N')$, $\Lambda_2(N')$, we say that they are convex-disjoint if their convex envelops are disjoint. (This is in order that we have (4.23-4.25) at our disposal.) To control the number of bad elementary regions at scale N_0, we now make additional incisions in the frequency space. Recall that (4.23, 4.24) pertain only to the projected elementary regions in $\mathbb{Z}^d$.

We are now ready to prove

Lemma 4.3. *Fix $x \in X'_N \cap \tilde{X}_{N_0}$, where X'_N is the set defined in (4.23, 4.24) and $\tilde{X}_{N_0}$ is defined as in (4.23, 4.24), but with $N_0^{1/C}$ replacing N_0. There exists a set Ω'_N,*

$$\operatorname{mes} \Omega'_N \leq e^{-N^{\frac{\beta}{2C}}},\tag{4.26}$$

such that if $\omega \notin \Omega'_N$, then for any $\Lambda(N) \in \mathcal{ER}(N)$ any fixed θ, there are at most **2** *convex- disjoint bad $\Lambda(N') \in \mathcal{ER}(N')$, $\Lambda(N') \cap \mathcal{T}(N) = \emptyset$, $N_0 \leq N' \leq 2N_0$ in $\Lambda(N)$ ($N = N_0^C$). Moreover Ω'_N is semi-algebraic with degree bounded above by $\mathcal{O}(1)N^{6d+\nu}$ and is contained in the union of at most $\mathcal{O}(1)N^{6d+\nu}$ components.*

Remark. Ω'_N is independent of $\mathcal{V}$, y_k. Observe also that we need localization information on the random Schrödinger operators at 2 scales, N_0 and $N_0^{1/C}$.

Proof. In view of (4.3, 4.4, 4.7, H3), for $\Lambda(N_0)$ such that $\Lambda(N_0) \cap \mathcal{T}(N) = \emptyset$, δS can be treated as a small perturbation. We only need to ensure the invertibility of $D^\theta_{\Lambda(N_0)}$. Assume $\Lambda(N_0), \Lambda'(N_0)$, and $\Lambda''(N_0)$ are 3 convex-disjoint *bad* elementary regions. So $\exists (n,j) \in \Lambda(N_0), (n',j') \in \Lambda'(N_0)$, $(n'',j'') \in \Lambda''(N_0)$, such that

$$\begin{aligned} &|\theta + n\cdot\omega + \mu_j| < 2e^{-N_0^\beta} \text{ or } |-\theta - n\cdot\omega + \mu_j| < 2e^{-N_0^\beta}; \\ &|\theta + n'\cdot\omega + \mu_{j'}| < 2e^{-N_0^\beta} \text{ or } |-\theta - n'\cdot\omega + \mu_{j'}| < 2e^{-N_0^\beta}; \end{aligned}\tag{4.27}$$

and

$$|\theta + n'' \cdot \omega + \mu_{j''}| < 2e^{-N_0^\beta} \text{ or } |-\theta - n'' \cdot \omega + \mu_{j''}| < 2e^{-N_0^\beta},$$

where μ_j, $\mu_{j'}, \mu_{j''}$ are eigenvalues of $\bar{\Lambda}(N_0), \bar{\Lambda}'(N_0)$, $\bar{\Lambda}''(N_0)$ respectively.

(4.27) implies that $\exists m, \lambda$ such that

$$|m \cdot \omega + \lambda| < 4e^{-N_0^\beta}, \tag{4.28}$$

where $m = \pm(n - n'),\text{ or } \pm(n' - n'') \text{ or } \pm(n - n'')$,

$$\lambda = \mu_j - \mu_{j'},\text{ or } \mu_{j'} - \mu_{j''} \text{ or } \mu_{j''} - \mu_j. \tag{4.29}$$

We use the same argument as in the proof of Lemma 2.3 of [BW], which we summarize below.

There are two possibilities: $m = 0, m \neq 0$. When $m = 0$, from pairwise disjointness (4.24, 4.25), (A6) implies

$$|\lambda| > e^{-N_0^{\beta'}} \qquad (0 < \beta' < \beta) \tag{4.30}$$

which contradicts (4.28).

When $m \neq 0$, (4.28) corresponds to at most

$$\mathcal{O}(1)N^\nu \cdot (N^d \cdot N_0^{2d+1})^2 < \mathcal{O}(1)N^{6d+\nu} \tag{4.31}$$

number of equations. Since each equation in (4.28) is a monomial of degree 1 in ω, the excluded set Ω'_N is of degree less than $\mathcal{O}(1)N^{6d+\nu}$. Since $|\omega|$ may be assumed to be bounded for each such equation, we exclude a set in ω of measure $\mathcal{O}(1)e^{-N_0^\beta}$. It is simple to see that for each equation in (4.28), the excluded set in ω has 1 single component.

So in conclusion, for fixed $x \in X'_N$, $\omega \in {\Omega'_N}^c$, there are at most 2 pair-wise disjoint $\Lambda(N') \in \mathcal{ER}(N')$, $\Lambda(N') \cap \mathcal{T}(N) = \emptyset$ such that the first inequality in (4.9) is violated by using (H3) and a simple perturbative argument.

Assume $\Lambda(N')$ is such that the first inequality of (4.9) is satisfied. So $|\pm\theta \pm n \cdot \omega + \mu_j| \geq 2e^{-N_0^\beta}$ for n, $j \in \Lambda(N')$ from above considerations. To obtain the second inequality we proceed as follows. Let $\bar{\Lambda}(N')$ be the projection of $\Lambda(N')$ onto $\mathbb{Z}^d$. In view of the restriction in the third expression in (4.9), we may assume diam $\bar{\Lambda}(N') \geq \frac{N_0}{10}$. We cover $\bar{\Lambda}(N')$ with elementary regions $\bar{\Lambda}(N_0^{1/C})$ of diameter $2N_0^{1/C}$.

Since $x \in X'_N \cap \tilde{X}_{N_0}$ and on $\tilde{X}_{N_0}$ for all E (of the form $E = \theta + n \cdot \omega$ here), there is at most 1 (pair-wise disjoint) $\bar{\Lambda}(N_0^{1/C})$ in $\bar{\Lambda}(N')$ where (A1) (with $m = \gamma$) is violated.

Using the resolvent equation, (A1) and the estimates $| \pm \theta \pm n \cdot \omega + \mu_j| \geq 2e^{-N_0^\beta}$ for $n,\, j \in \Lambda(N')$ for the bad $\bar{\Lambda}(N_0^{1/C})$, we obtain exponential decay in the j direction for $\bar{\Lambda}(N')$ for all E (of the form $E = \theta + n \cdot \omega$ here).

We obtain the second inequality in (4.9) for this $\Lambda(N')$ by another application of resolvent series in δS and using (H3). This holds for all $\Lambda(N')$ such that the first inequality of (4.9) is satisfied, in view of the definition of $\tilde{X}_{N_0}$. Using $N_0 = N^{1/C}$, we obtain the lemma. $\square$

Number of bad elementary regions at scale N_0 intersecting $\mathcal{T}(N)$.

We now estimate the number of bad $\Lambda(N') \in \mathcal{ER}(N')$, $\Lambda(N') \subset \Lambda(N)$, $\Lambda(N') \cap \mathcal{T}(N) \neq \emptyset$, $\mathcal{T}(N)$ as in (4.21), $N_0 \leq N' \leq 2N_0$, using semi-algebraic set techniques. Here it is important to emphasize the $\mathbb{Z}^d$ coordinate of the center of elementary regions as the linearized operator is not a Toeplitz operator in the $\mathbb{Z}^d$ variable. We look at elementary regions with centers in $\{0\} \times \mathbb{Z}^d$. We write $\mathcal{ER}(N', j)$ for the set of elementary regions centered at $j \in \mathbb{Z}^d$. For any $\Lambda(N', j) \in \mathcal{ER}(N', j)$, let $\mathcal{B}(N', j) \overset{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{B}_{\beta,\gamma}(N', j)$ be a set such that on $\mathcal{B}^c(N', j)$, (4.9) hold. (Later for more general elementary regions centered in $i \in \mathbb{Z}^{d+\nu}$, we will use the same notations as used here.)

Assume $\exists X_{N',j}, \Omega_{N',j}$ such that for $x \in X_{N',j}$, $\omega \in DC_{A,c}(2N) \backslash \Omega_{N',j}$,

$$\operatorname{mes} \mathcal{B}(N', j) \leq e^{-N_0^\sigma} \quad (N_0 \leq N' \leq 2N_0, \quad 0 < \sigma < 1). \tag{4.32}$$

Let

$$\begin{aligned} X''_{N_0} &\overset{\text{def}}{=} \bigcap_{j \in [-3N_0, 3N_0]^d} \; \bigcap_{N_0 \leq N' \leq 2N_0} X_{N',j}, \\ \Omega''_{N_0} &\overset{\text{def}}{=} \bigcup_{j \in [-3N_0, 3N_0]^d} \; \bigcup_{N_0 \leq N' \leq 2N_0} \Omega_{N',j}, \\ \mathcal{A} &\overset{\text{def}}{=} \bigcup_{j \in [-3N_0, 3N_0]^d} \; \bigcup_{N_0 \leq N' \leq 2N_0} \; \bigcup_{\mathcal{ER}(N',j)} \mathcal{B}(N', j), \\ \operatorname{mes} \mathcal{A} &\leq \mathcal{O}(1) N_0^{2d+\nu} e^{-N_0^\sigma} \quad \text{from (4.32).} \end{aligned} \tag{4.33}$$

Lemma 4.4. *Let $N = N_0^C$. For any fixed $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$, let*

$$I = \{n \in [-N, N]^\nu \,| n \cdot \omega + \theta \in \mathcal{A}\}. \tag{4.34}$$

Fix $x \in X''_{N_0}$. Then for $\omega \in DC_{A,c}(2N) \backslash \Omega''_{N_0}$,

$$|I| \leq \mathcal{O}_{d,v}(1) N_0^{6(d+\nu)} = \mathcal{O}_{d,v}(1) N^{\frac{6(d+\nu)}{C}} \overset{\text{def}}{=} N^{1-b_0}, \tag{4.35}$$

$0 < b_0 < 1$ and assuming $6(d+\nu) < C < N_0^{\sigma/2}$. Hence there are at most $\mathcal{O}(1)N^{1-b_0}$ ($\mathcal{O}(1)$ a universal geometric constant) pair-wise disjoint bad $\Lambda(N') \in \mathcal{ER}(N')$, $\Lambda(N') \cap \mathcal{T}(N) \neq \emptyset$, $N_0 \leq N' \leq 2N_0$ in $\Lambda(N)$ ($N = N_0^C$).

Proof. Since the Green's function is the ratio of two determinants and the norm of the Green's function can be replaced by its Hilbert-Schmidt norm, (4.9) can be reexpressed as polynomial inequalities in θ. $\mathcal{A}$ is therefore a *semi-algebraic* set. (See [Ba, section 7 of BGS].)

$\mathcal{A}$ is defined by

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathcal{O}(1)N_0^d \cdot N_0^{d+\nu} \cdot N_0^{2(d+\nu)} \\ &\cong \mathcal{O}(1)N_0^{4d+3\nu} \end{aligned} \tag{4.36}$$

number of polynomials, N_0^d for number of centers, $N_0^{d+\nu}$ number of elementary regions per center, $N_0^{2(d+\nu)}$ number of matrix elements. Each polynomial is of degree $N_0^{2(d+\nu)}$ in θ (as one squares the matrix elements.)

Basu's Theorem [Ba], restated as Theorem 7.3 in [BGS], then gives that the number of connected components in $\mathcal{A}$ does not exceed $N_0^{6(d+\nu)}$. If there are $n, n', n \neq n'$, such that n, n' belong to the same connected component of $\mathcal{A}$, then from the last inequality in (4.33),

$$|(n-n') \cdot \omega| \leq \mathcal{O}(1)N_0^{2d+\nu}e^{-N_0^\sigma}. \tag{4.37}$$

Since $n, n' \in [-N, N]^\nu, n - n' \in [-2N, 2N]^\nu, N = N_0^C$, $\omega \in DC_{A,c}(2N)$ is in contradiction with (4.37) for $C < N_0^{\sigma/2} < \frac{N_0^\sigma}{2A \log N_0}$ (assuming $N_0 \gg 1$), so there can be at most 1 integral point in a connected component of $\mathcal{A}$. We therefore obtain (4.35).

Let $i = (j, n) \in \mathbb{Z}^{d+\nu}$. Since $\Lambda(N', i) = \Lambda(N', j) + n$ and T is a Toeplitz operator in the $\mathbb{Z}^\nu$ variable, we obtain the second conclusion of the lemma. ☐

Remark. C will be a *fixed* expansion factor. So the upper bound on C will be satisfied for all $N \geq N_0$ as soon as it is satisfied for an initial N_0.

A large deviation estimate in θ.

Lemmas 4.3, 4.4 combined give that the number of bad elementary regions at scale N_0 in $\Lambda(N)$ is at most N^{1-b_0}, where

$$N = N_0^C, \quad b_0 = 1 - \frac{6(d+\nu)}{C} \quad (6(d+\nu) < C < N_0^{\sigma/2})$$

from (4.35). This enables us to use a Cartan-type theorem for analytic matrix valued functions (see [B5]) to prove a large deviation estimate on $\|T_N^\theta(y_{i'})^{-1}\|$, necessary for the proof of Lemma 4.1. The proof of the lemma is very similar to the one in [BW] (See also [BGS]), after using (4.15) to appropriately adjust $y_{i'}$ according to the scale N. So we state (without details of the proof)

Lemma 4.5. *Let* b_0*,* β*,* σ*,* γ *be fixed positive numbers, so that*

$$0 < b_0, \beta, \sigma < 1 \text{ and } \beta + b_0 > 1 + 3\sigma. \tag{4.38}$$

Let $N_0 \leq N_1$ *be positive integers satisfying*

$$\bar{N}_0(\beta, \sigma, \gamma) \leq 100 N_0 \leq N_1^{\sigma} \tag{4.39}$$

with some large constant $\bar{N}_0$ *depending only on* β, σ, γ*. Assume that for any* $N_0 \leq L \leq N_1$*, any* $\Lambda(L) \in \mathcal{ER}(L, i)$*,* $i \in \mathbb{Z}^{d+\nu}$*,*

$$\operatorname{mes} \mathcal{B}_{\beta,\gamma}(L, i) \leq e^{-L^{\sigma}}. \tag{4.40}$$

Let $\bar{X}_N$*,* $\bar{\Omega}_N$ *be the sets such that on* $\bar{X}_N$ *and* $DC_{A,c}(2N) \backslash \bar{\Omega}_N$*, (4.40) holds for all* $i \in [-N, N]^{d+\nu}$*,* $L \in [N_0, N_1]$*. Let* X'_N*,* $\tilde{X}_{N^{1/C}}$ *be the sets defined in (4.23, 4.24) and Lemma 4.3,* Ω'_N *the corresponding frequency set as in Lemma 4.3. If*

$$\begin{aligned} &x \in X'_N \cap \tilde{X}_{N^{1/C}} \cap \bar{X}_N, \\ &\omega \in DC_{A,c}(2N) \backslash \{\Omega'_N \cup \bar{\Omega}_N\}, \end{aligned} \tag{4.41}$$

then

$$\operatorname{mes} \{\theta | \, \|[T_N^{\theta}]^{-1}\| > e^{N^{\beta}}\} < e^{-N^{3\sigma}}, \tag{4.42}$$

where T_N *is restriction of* T *to any* $\Lambda \in \mathcal{ER}(N)$*, the elementary regions centered at* 0*, provided* $N_0^{C_1} \leq N \leq N_1^{\sigma C_1}$*,* $C_1 \gg \max(\frac{1}{\sigma}, 6(d+\nu))$ *depending only on* β, σ*.*

Remark. We note that from (4.23, 4.24), the dependence of the probability set $X_{L,i}$ (on which (4.40) holds) on $i \in \mathbb{Z}^{d+\nu}$ is only through the $\mathbb{Z}^d$ coordinate. For simplicity, we keep the notation $X_{L,i}$. The set $\Omega_{L,i}$ (on the complement of which (4.40) holds), on the other hand, does have full dependence on i.

A summary of the proof.

We use analytic and harmonic function theory together with a 2-scale (in the range $[N_0, N_1]$) analysis to control the measure of the set in (4.42) at scale $N \gg N_0$. (See the proofs of Lemma 4.4 in [BGS] and Lemma 6.2 in [BW].) For a given N, let these 2 scales L_1, $L_2 \in [N_0, N_1]$, $L_1 < L_2$, satisfy

$$\log L_1 \sim \frac{1}{C_1} \log N, \quad \log L_2 \sim \frac{1}{\sigma} \log L_1 \sim \frac{1}{C_1 \sigma} \log N,$$

C_1 as in the lemma, $C_1 \gg 1/\sigma$. We reiterate the main line of arguments below.

- Fix θ. Let

$$\Lambda_*^c = \{m \in \Lambda(N) | \exists \, \Lambda_1 \in \mathcal{ER}(L_1), N_0 \leq L_1 \leq 2N_0, \Lambda_1 \subset m + [-L_1, L_1]^{d+\nu}, \Lambda_1 \text{ is bad}\}, \tag{4.43}$$

For x, ω satisfying (4.41),

$$|\Lambda_*^c| \leq N^{1-b_0} \quad (b_0 > 0), \tag{4.44}$$

by Lemmas 4.3, 4.4. Since $X''_{N_0} \supset \bar{X}_N$, $\Omega''_{N_0} \subset \bar{\Omega}_N$, where X''_{N_0}, Ω''_{N_0} as defined by the first two equations of (4.33).

- Let Λ_* be, roughly speaking, the complement of the set in (4.43). For more precise definition, which requires a partition of Λ, see the beginning of the proof of Lemma 4.4 in [BGS]. Using an elementary resolvent expansion, Lemma B in the appendix, which is Lemma 2.2 of [BGS] reiterated, we obtain an upper bound on $\|[T^\theta_{\Lambda_*}]^{-1}\|$ at fixed θ by using the decay estimate on the Λ_1's, elementary regions at scale L_1, in Λ_*. By definition they are all *good*. By standard Neumann series arguments, this bound is preserved inside the disk $B(\theta, e^{-N_0}) \subset \mathbb{C}$.

Remark. We have control over the size of Λ_* via (4.43, 4.44), but not its geometry. Typically Λ_* is *non-convex*, hence the need for elementary regions which are more general than cubes, in particular L-shaped regions, in view of Lemma B.

- Define a matrix-valued analytic function $A(\theta')$ on $B(\theta, e^{-N_0})$ as

  $$\begin{aligned} A(\theta') = {} & R_{\Lambda_*^c} T_N^{\theta'} R_{\Lambda_*^c} \\ & - R_{\Lambda_*^c} T_N^{\theta'} R_{\Lambda_*} [T_{\Lambda_*}^{\theta'}]^{-1} R_{\Lambda_*} T_N^{\theta'} R_{\Lambda_*^c} \end{aligned} \tag{4.45}$$

  where $\Lambda_*^c = \Lambda \backslash \Lambda_*$, R_{Λ_*}, $R_{\Lambda_*^c}$ are projections. From (4.44), $A(\theta')$ is a rank $\mathcal{O}(N^{1-b_0}) \times \mathcal{O}(N^{1-b_0})$ matrix. The raison d'etre of introducing $A(\theta')$ is the following inequality:

  $$\|A(\theta')^{-1}\| \lesssim \|(T_N^{\theta'})^{-1}\| \lesssim e^{2N_0} \|A(\theta')^{-1}\|,$$

  (see Lemma 4.8 of [BGS]). So to bound $\|(T_N^{\theta'})^{-1}\|$, it is sufficient to bound $\|A(\theta')^{-1}\|$, which is of smaller dimension.

- Toward that end, we introduce an intermediate scale L_2, $\log L_2 \sim (\log L_1)/\sigma > \log L_1$. We work in an interval $\Theta = \{\theta' | |\theta' - \theta| < e^{-N_0}\}$. Using (4.40) for the Λ_2's at scale L_2 and in Λ, Lemma B, we obtain an upper bound on $\|[T_N^{\theta'}]^{-1}\|$ except for a set of θ' of measure smaller than $e^{-\mathcal{O}(L_2^\sigma)}$. So there exists $y \in \Theta$, such that we have *both* an upper bound on $\|A^{-1}(\theta')\|$ at $\theta' = y$, hence a lower bound on the smallest eigenvalue of $A(\theta)$ and an a priori upper bound on $\|A(\theta')\|$, which comes from the boundedness of $T_N^{\theta'}$ and the bound on $[T_{\Lambda^*}^{\theta'}]^{-1}$ (see (4.45)).

- Transfering the estimates on $\|A(\theta')\|$, $\|A^{-1}(\theta')\|$ into estimates on $\log|\det A(\theta')|$, which is subharmonic and using either Cartan-type theorem (see sect. 11.2 in [Le]) or proceeding as in the proof of Lemma 4.4 of [BGS] or Chap XIV of [B5], we obtain the lemma by covering the interval $I = (-\mathcal{O}(N_1^{\sigma C_1}), \mathcal{O}(N_1^{\sigma C_1}))$ with intervals of size e^{-N_0}. (Recall (4.39) and that for all $\theta \notin I$, $T_N^{\theta'}$ is automatically invertible.) $\square$

Iteration Lemma

To obtain exponential decay of T_N^{-1}, we need

Lemma 4.6. *Suppose $M, N \in \mathbb{N}^+$ are such that for some $0 < \tau < 1$*

$$N^\tau \leq M \leq 2N^\tau. \tag{4.46}$$

Let $\Lambda_0 \in \mathcal{ER}(N)$ be an elementary region with the property that for all $\Lambda \subset \Lambda_0, \Lambda \in \mathcal{ER}(L)$ with $M \leq L \leq N$,

$$\|(T_L^\theta)^{-1}\| \leq e^{L^\beta} \qquad (0 < \beta < 1). \tag{4.47}$$

We say that $\Lambda \in \mathcal{ER}(L), \Lambda \subset \Lambda_0$ is good, if in addition to (4.47),

$$\|(T_L^\theta)^{-1}(k, k')\| \leq e^{-\gamma|k-k'|} \tag{4.48}$$

for all $k, k' \in \Lambda, |k - k'| > L/10$. Otherwise Λ is called bad.

Assume that for any family $\mathcal{F}$ of pairwise disjoint bad M'-regions in Λ_0 with

$$\begin{aligned} M + 1 \leq M' &\leq 2M + 1 \\ \sharp\mathcal{F} &\leq N^\beta (0 < \beta < 1). \end{aligned} \tag{4.49}$$

Then one has

$$|(T_N^\theta)^{-1}(k, k')| \leq e^{-\gamma'|k-k'|} \tag{4.50}$$

for all $k, k' \in \Lambda_0, |k - k'| > N/10$, $\gamma' = \gamma - N^{-\delta'} (\delta' > 0)$, provided $N \gg N_0(\beta, \tau, \gamma)$.

The proof of the above lemma is written out in detail in [BGS]. The only difference is that instead of being tridiagonal, T_L^θ has exponentially decaying off-diagonal elements from (H3). So $\gamma = \gamma(\alpha)$. The proof goes through. So we do not repeat it here. (See also [BW].) The gist is as follows.

The exponential decay estimate at scale N in (4.50) is obtained from exponential decay estimate in (4.48) at smaller scales M' by using (4.15), the norm estimate in (4.47) and the resolvent identity. To implement this, we use a sequence of scales $M_{j+1} = M_j^{C'}$, with $M_0 = M$, C' is chosen such that $C'\beta < 1$, $C'\tau \leq 1$. For each elementary region at scale M_{j+1}, $\Lambda(M_{j+1})$ and for each $k \in \Lambda(M_{j+1})$, we exhaust $\Lambda(M_{j+1})$ by an increasing sequence of annuli centered at k of width $2M_j$, or more precisely the intersection of this sequence with $\Lambda(M_{j+1})$. Roughly speaking, an annulus is good, if it does not intersect a bad cube of the previous scale M_j.

In each of the connected components of the complement of the bad annuli, we apply the resolvent identity using the estimate in (4.48) for elementary regions of size M_j. In the bad annuli, we use (4.47). From (4.49), the number of bad annuli is at most sublinear in M_{j+1}. Using a multiscale induction argument to reach the scale N, we obtain the exponential decay in (4.50), when $|k-k'|>N/10$. δ' is determined from (4.47, 4.49), $\delta'\simeq\tau(1-\beta C')$. $\square$

Let $\mathcal{B}_{\beta,\gamma}(N,i)$, $i\in\mathbb{Z}^{d+\nu}$ be a set such that on the complement, (4.9) hold. When $i=0$, we write $\mathcal{B}_{\beta,\gamma}(N,0)=\mathcal{B}_{\beta,\gamma}(N)$. As before let

$$\begin{aligned}&X_{N,i},\ \Omega_{N,i} \text{ be the probability, frequency subsets on which and}\\ &\text{on the complement of which mes } \mathcal{B}_{\beta,\gamma}(N,i)\le e^{-N^{\sigma}}\end{aligned}\tag{4.51}$$

Combining Lemmas 4.5, 4.6 with (4.23-4.25), Lemmas 4.3, 4.4, we obtain

Lemma 4.7. *Assume that for any* $\tilde N_0\le N_0\le\tilde N_0^C$, $\max(\frac{1}{\sigma},6(d+\nu)\ll C<\tilde N_0^{\sigma/2}$ *(*$\tilde N_0(\epsilon,\delta)\gg 1$*), any* $\Lambda(N_0)\in\mathcal{ER}(N_0,i)$, $i\in\mathbb{Z}^{d+\nu}$

$$\operatorname{mes}\mathcal{B}_{\beta,\gamma}(N_0,i)\le e^{-N_0^{\sigma}}\qquad(0<\sigma<1).\tag{4.52}$$

Let $[\tilde N_0^C,\tilde N_0^{C^2\sigma}]$ *be the next interval of scales. For any* $N\in[\tilde N_0^C,\tilde N_0^{C^2\sigma}]$*, write* $N=N_0^C$ *with* $N_0\in[\tilde N_0,\tilde N_0^C]$*. Let* X'_N, $\tilde X_{N^{1/C}}$ *be the sets defined in (4.23, 4.24) and Lemma 4.3,* Ω'_N *the set defined in Lemma 4.3, satisfying*

$$\begin{aligned}&\operatorname{mes}X'_N\ge 1-\frac{\mathcal{O}(1)}{N^{\frac{2}{C}(p'-d(C+1)-1)}}\qquad(p'>d(C^2+1)+1),\\ &\operatorname{mes}\tilde X_{N^{1/C}}\ge 1-\frac{\mathcal{O}(1)}{N^{\frac{2}{C^2}(p'-d(C^2+1)-1)}}\qquad(p'>d(C^2+1)+1),\\ &\operatorname{mes}\Omega'_N\le e^{-N^{\frac{\beta}{2C}}},\end{aligned}\tag{4.53}$$

in view of (4.25, 4.26).

Let $\bar X_N$, $\bar\Omega_N$ *be the sets such that on* $\bar X_N$ *and* $DC_{A,c}(2N)\backslash\bar\Omega_N$*, (4.52) holds for all* $i\in[-\tilde N_0^{C^2\sigma},\tilde N_0^{C^2\sigma}]^{d+\nu}$*, all* $N_0\in[\tilde N_0,\tilde N_0^C]$*. If*

$$\begin{aligned}&x\in X'_N\cap\tilde X_{N^{1/C}}\cap\bar X_N\overset{\text{def}}{=}X_N,\\ &\textit{mes } X_N\ge 1-1/N^{p''}\ \textit{with}\ p''=p''(p',C,d+\nu)>1\ \textit{by choosing}\ p'\ \textit{large enough};\\ &\omega\in DC_{A,c}(2N)\backslash\{\Omega'_N\cup\bar\Omega_N\}\overset{\text{def}}{=}DC_{A,c}(2N)\backslash\Omega_N,\\ &\textit{mes } \Omega_N\le e^{-N^{\frac{\beta}{3C^2}}},\\ &\Omega_N\ \textit{is semi-algebraic with degree less than}\ N^{C^2(d+\nu)}\end{aligned}\tag{4.54}$$

then

$$\operatorname{mes} \mathcal{B}_{\beta,\gamma'}(N) \le e^{-N^\sigma} \qquad (0 < \sigma < 1). \tag{4.55}$$

where $\gamma' = \gamma - N^{-\delta'}$ *(*$\delta' > 0$*).*

Proof. Applying Lemma 4.5 using (4.52), we obtain the large deviation estimate on $\|[T_N^\theta]^{-1}\|$. Choosing $0 < \tau < \frac{1}{C\sigma}$, for x, ω in the sets defined in (4.54), (4.49) is satisfied. (Here we need the definition that an N^τ-region is bad if it intersects a bad N_0-region. Otherwise it is good. On the good N^τ-region, (4.48) is obtained by using resolvent expansion (Lemma B) and (4.9) for N_0-regions.) Hence Lemma 4.6 is available and we obtain (4.55). The estimates on X_N, Ω_N follow from (4.51, 4.53) and the constructions in Lemme 4.3-4.5. ☐

Proof of Lemma 4.1. Assume $\bar N_0$ (to be determined below) is such that Lemma 4.7 is available. For the scales $\bar N_0 \le N \le \bar N_0^C$, we use Neumann series in ϵ and δ a la Lemma 4.2 and its proof. For the scales $N \ge \bar N_0^C$, we use Lemma 4.7.

From Lemma 4.2, we need

$$\bar N_0 \ge M_0(d+\nu, \sigma, \beta) \tag{4.56}$$

and

$$\epsilon_0 = \delta_0 = \frac{1}{2} e^{-2\bar N_0^{C\beta}}. \tag{4.57}$$

From Lemma 4.7 and the choice of σ, the expansion factor C needs to satisfy

$$\max(\frac{1}{\sigma}, 6(d+\nu)) \ll C < \bar N_0^{\sigma/2}. \tag{4.58}$$

From Theorem A and (4.19), $\bar N_0$ needs further to verify

$$\bar N_0 > \max(Q, M_0), \tag{4.59}$$

where $M_0 = M_0(d+\nu, \beta, \sigma)$ as in Lemma 4.2. Fix $\bar N_0$ satisfying (4.59), C satisfying (4.58). (4.57) determines ϵ_0, δ_0.

For the scales $\bar N_0 \le N \le \bar N_0^C$, $\bar N_0$ satisfying (4.59), the estimates

$$\begin{aligned} &\|[T_N^\theta]^{-1}\| < e^{N^\beta} \qquad (0 < \beta < 1), \\ &|[T_N^\theta]^{-1}(\ell, \ell')| < e^{-\alpha|\ell - \ell'|} \qquad (\alpha \text{ as in } (H3)), \\ &|\ell - \ell'| > N/10, \end{aligned}$$

for $0 < \epsilon \le \epsilon_0$, $0 < \delta \le \delta_0$. are obtained using Neumann series by shifting in θ only. So

$$\operatorname{mes} X_{N,i} = 1, \quad \operatorname{mes} \Omega_{N,i} = 0, (\bar N_0 \le N \le \bar N_0^C),$$

where $X_{N,i}$, $\Omega_{N,i}$ are as defined in (4.51), and (4.52) hold.

Let

$$\begin{aligned} X \overset{\text{def}}{=} & \bigcap_N \bigcap_{i\in[-3N^C,3N^C]^{d+\nu}} X_{N,i} \\ = & \bigcap_N \bigcap_{j\in[-3N^C,3N^C]^{d}} X_{N,j}, \end{aligned} \tag{4.60}$$

where the second equality follows from the remark after Lemma 4.5, j being the $\mathbb{Z}^d$ coordinate of i;

$$\Omega \overset{\text{def}}{=} \bigcup_N \bigcup_{i\in[-3N^C,3N^C]^{d+\nu}} \Omega_{N,i}, \tag{4.61}$$

where $X_{N,j}$, $\Omega_{N,i}$ are as defined in (4.51).

On X, $DC_{A,c}\backslash\Omega$, Lemma 4.7 is available with the initial $\gamma = \alpha$ from Lemma 4.2 for iteration to all scales. Estimating the measure of X and Ω using (4.53, 4.54, 4.60, 4.61), using the measure estimates on the bad set in θ from Lemma 4.2 and 4.7, we obtain the Lemma by taking $p' \simeq \mathcal{O}_d(1)C^3$. $\square$

5. Invertibility of $T(y_i)$, Q-equations and determination of ω

Fix $x \in X \subset \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{Z}^d}\backslash\mathbb{R}^\nu$, defined in (4.12), which generates a corresponding set Ω as in Lemma 4.1. The main work of this section is to convert the measure estimates in θ for fixed $\omega \in \mathbb{R}^\nu\backslash\Omega$, fixed $\mathcal{V} \in \mathbb{R}^\nu$ in Lemma 4.1 into measure estimates in $\omega = \omega(\mathcal{V}) \in \mathbb{R}^\nu$ and extend to $(\omega, \mathcal{V}) \in \mathbb{R}^{2\nu}$ in the neighborhood of $\omega = \omega(\mathcal{V})$, while keeping θ fixed: $\theta = 0$ and addressing the original family of linearized operators $T_N(y_i)$ defined in (4.2-4.5), where y_i is the i^{th} approximant to the P-equations in (4.1). This is possible because T_N^θ is only a function of $n\cdot\omega+\theta$, $T_N^\theta = T'(n\cdot\omega+\theta)$, cf. (4.2-4.4, 4.7).

Since θ is now fixed at 0, before doing the conversion, we need to make a further restriction in X in order that the spectrum of the various restricted random Schrödinger operators stay away from 0. This is needed when $n = 0$ and we cannot vary ω to have invertibility of the linearized operators, cf. (4.3).

So we modify the definition of X'_N in (4.23, 4.24) to also include the condition

$$\text{dist }(\sigma(\bar\Lambda(N')), 0) > e^{-N_0^{\beta'}} \quad (0 < \beta' < \beta) \tag{5.0}$$

for all $\bar\Lambda(N') \cap [-N,N]^d \neq \emptyset$, $(N_0 \le N' \le 2N_0)$, i.e., we require (4.30) to hold also when $\lambda = \mu_j$, eigenvalues of restricted random Schrödinger operators and not just differences of pairs of eigenvalues. In view of the Wegner estimate (A7), this leaves the measure of the set X'_N in (4.25) essentially unchanged.

This generates the restricted probability set $\tilde{X} \subset X \subset \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{Z}^d} \backslash \mathbb{R}^\nu$, on which Lemma 4.1 holds. Rename $\tilde{X}$ as X and let Ω be its corresponding frequency set.

To do the conversion, we need to supplement the measure estimates in (4.14) by the fact that the bad sets $\mathcal{B}(N)$ defined from (4.9) has a semi-algebraic description in terms of $(\omega, \mathcal{V}, \theta)$, enabling us to use the decomposition Lemma 9.9 of [B5]. Once we have the necessary estimates on $[T_N(y_i)]^{-1}$ after removing a small set in $\omega_i = \omega_i(\mathcal{V})$ (we put the suffix i here to stress that it is the i^{th} approximation), we construct the next approximant y_{i+1} according to (3.9), which in turn is used to construct $\omega_{i+1} = \omega_{i+1}(\mathcal{V})$.

In this section, we primarily address the invertibility of $T_N(y_i), N = M^{i+1}$. Since the estimate on $T_N(y_i)$ and the construction of y_{i+1} are interconnected, it is good at this point to lay down the complete induction hypothesis. (In section 4, we used first part of the induction hypothesis (H1, 3) and the first inequality of (H2) to derive Lemma 4.1.) The first few approximations are obtained by using direct perturbation series in ϵ, δ, (see (4.9), as well as the text and the remark afterwards). So $0 < \epsilon \leq \epsilon_0 \ll 1$, $0 < \delta \leq \delta_0 \ll 1$, and we have $\alpha = \mathcal{O}(1)|\log(\epsilon + \delta)|$.

On the *entire* $(\omega, \mathcal{V})$ parameter space, we assume:

(H1) $\operatorname{supp} y_i \subset [-M^i, M^i]^{d+\nu}$ $(i \geq 1)$,

(H2) $\|\Delta_i y\| < \delta_i, \|\partial \Delta_i y\| < \bar{\delta}_i$,

where $\| \ \|$ stands for $\sup_{\omega, \mathcal{V}} \| \ \|_{\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^{d+\nu})}$ (Recall that we identify y with $\hat{y}$; ∂ refers to derivation in ω or $\mathcal{V}$.). $\delta_i, \bar{\delta}_i$ will be shown to satisfy:

$$\delta_i < \sqrt{\epsilon + \delta} M^{-(\frac{4}{3})^i},$$
$$\bar{\delta}_i < \sqrt{\epsilon + \delta} M^{-\frac{1}{2}(\frac{4}{3})^i}.$$

(H3) $|y_i(k)| < e^{-\alpha|k|}$ for some $\alpha > 0$

(The constant in front of the exponential in (H3) is 1, because $|a_\ell| \ll 1$, $\ell = 1, ..., \nu$, see (1.9).)

From (H2), y is a C^1 function on $(\omega, \mathcal{V})$. Application of the implicit function theorem to the Q-equations in (2.12) with

$$y = \begin{pmatrix} u \\ v \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \hat{u} \\ \hat{v} \end{pmatrix} = y_i \tag{5.1}$$

yields

$$\omega_i = \mathcal{V} + (\varepsilon + \delta)\varphi_i(\mathcal{V}), \text{ with } \|\partial \varphi_i\| < C, \tag{5.2}$$

whose graph we denote by Γ_i. Recall that a priori, y_i are only defined on certain intervals in $(\omega, \mathcal{V})$ space. It is in order to use the implicit function theorem that we extend y_i to the entire $(\omega, \mathcal{V})$ space, using the estimates on ∂y_i in (H2). (H2) and (2.12) imply, moreover, that

$$\|\varphi_i - \varphi_{i-1}\| \leq \mathcal{O}(1)\|y_i - y_{i-1}\| < \mathcal{O}(1)\delta_i, \tag{5.3}$$

which in turn implies that

$$\Gamma_i \text{ is an } (\epsilon + \delta)\delta_i\text{-approximation of } \Gamma_{i-1}. \tag{5.4}$$

At each stage i, define

$$M_0 = \mathcal{O}(1)(i+1)^{C/2}(\log M)^{C/2} \tag{5.5}$$

for some $C > 0$ and $\Omega_{M_0,k}$ as defined in (4.51). Unlike (H1-3), the following hypothesis is only assumed to hold on *certain* intervals in $\mathbb{R}^{2\nu}$, the $(\omega, \mathcal{V})$-parameter space.

(H4) There is a collection Σ_i of intervals I in $\mathbb{R}^{2\nu}$ of size M^{-i^C}, same C as in (5.5), such that

(H4, 0) $(I \cap \Gamma_i) \subset (DC_{A,c}^{(i)} \backslash \Omega_i)$, where

$$DC_{A,c}^{(i)} \overset{\text{def}}{=} DC_{A,c}(2N), \quad N = M^i,$$
$$\Omega_i \overset{\text{def}}{=} \cup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d \cap [-2M_0, 2M_0]^d}\, \Omega_{M_0,k}, \quad i > i_0 > 0$$

(see the remark after (H4, iv) concerning i_0).

(H4, i) On $I \in \Sigma_i, y_i(\omega, \mathcal{V})$ is given by a rational function in $(\omega, \mathcal{V})$ of degree at most $M^{qi^3} (q \in \mathbb{N}^+)$.

(H4, ii) For $(\omega, \mathcal{V}) \in \bigcup_{I \in \Sigma_i} I$

$$\begin{aligned} &\|F(y_i)\| < \kappa_i \\ &\|\partial F(y_i)\| < \bar{\kappa}_i. \end{aligned} \tag{5.6}$$

In (6.20) $\kappa_i, \bar{\kappa}_i$ will be shown to satisfy:

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa_i &< \sqrt{\epsilon + \delta} M^{-(\frac{4}{3})^{i+2}}, \\ \bar{\kappa}_i &< \sqrt{\epsilon + \delta} M^{-\frac{1}{2}(\frac{4}{3})^{i+2}}. \end{aligned} \tag{5.7}$$

(H4, iii) For $(\omega, \mathcal{V}) \in \bigcup_{I \in \Sigma_i} I$,

$$T_N = T_N(y_{i-1}), N = M^i$$

satisfies

$$\|T_N^{-1}\| \le M^{i^C}$$
$$|T_N^{-1}(k,k')| \le e^{-\alpha|k-k'|} \text{ for } |k-k'| > i^C.$$

(H4, iv) Each $I \in \Sigma_i$ is contained in an interval $I' \in \Sigma_{i-1}$ and

$$\text{mes}_\nu\big(\Gamma_i \bigcap\big(\bigcup_{I\in\Sigma_{i-1}} I \backslash \bigcup_{I\in\Sigma_i} I'\big)\big) < M^{-i/5}.$$

Remark. (H4, 0) is only needed for $i > i_0$ to ensure the availability of Lemma 4.1. Up to stage i_0, we use direct ϵ, δ perturbation series, where the Diophantine property of ω is not required, (cf. Lemma 4.2).

Contrary to related estimates on $\Delta_i y, \partial\Delta_i y$ in (H2). (5.6, 5.7) *cannot* be extended to the entire $(\omega, \mathcal{V})$ space. This is because, as mentioned earlier, outside the intervals in Σ_i, y_i are no longer close to solutions to the P-equations in (2.16).

Invertibility of $T_N(y_i), N = M^{i+1}$

Assume (H1-4) hold at stage i. To construct y_{i+1}, we need to control

$$[T_N(y_i)]^{-1}, N = M^{i+1},$$

with a further restriction of the $(\omega, \mathcal{V})$-parameter set. This will give us (H4,iii) at stage $i+1$.

We accomplish this by covering $[-M^{i+1}, M^{i+1}]^{d+\nu}$ with $[-M^i, M^i]^{d+\nu}$ and intervals $[-M_0, M_0]^{d+\nu} + k$, M_0 as in (5.5), $k \in \mathbb{Z}^{d+\nu}$, $M^i/2 < |k| < M^{i+1}$ and using the resolvent identity. We first estimate $[T_{M^i}(y_i)]^{-1}$. Fix $(\omega, \mathcal{V}) \in \bigcup_{I\in\Sigma_i} I$. (H4,iii) at stage i gives

$$\begin{aligned} &\|[T_{M^i}(y_{i-1})]^{-1}\| \le M^{i^C}, \\ &|[T_{M^i}(y_{i-1})]^{-1}(k,k')| \le e^{-\alpha|k-k'|}\,(|k-k'| > i^C). \end{aligned} \tag{5.8}$$

We write

$$\begin{aligned} T_{M^i}(y_i) &= T_{M^i}(y_{i-1}) + [T_{M^i}(y_i) - T_{M^i}(y_{i-1})] \\ &\overset{\text{def}}{=} A + B \end{aligned} \tag{5.9}$$

From the first inequality in (5.8)

$$\|A^{-1}\| \le M^{i^C}. \tag{5.10}$$

The first inequality of (H2) at stage i gives

$$\|B\| < \mathcal{O}(1) M^{-(\frac{4}{3})^i}. \tag{5.11}$$

So

$$\|[T_{M^i}(y_i)]^{-1}\| \leq 2M^{i^C}, \text{ for } i > C^2. \tag{5.12}$$

To obtain pointwise estimate on $T_{M^i}^{-1}(y_i)$, we use (5.9) and resolvent series. A^{-1} has off-diagonal decay from (5.8), B has off-diagonal decay from (H3) at stage i. Iterating the resolvent series and using (5.12), we obtain

$$|[T_{M^i}(y_i)]^{-1}(k,k')| \leq e^{-\alpha'|k-k'|} \, (|k-k'| > i^C), \tag{5.13}$$

with $\alpha' = \alpha - M^{-i\delta'} > \alpha/2$ ($\delta' > 0$), uniformly in i.

We now study $|[T(y_i)]^{-1}|$ on the M_0 intervals, M_0 as in (5.5). We distinguish 2 types of M_0 intervals J in $[-M^{i+1}, M^{i+1}]^{d+\nu}$:

- $J \cap [-M_0, M_0]^d \times [-M^{i+1}, M^{i+1}]^\nu = \emptyset$ (a)
- $J \cap [-M_0, M_0]^d \times [-M^{i+1}, M^{i+1}]^\nu \neq \emptyset$ (b)

For type a, we use direct perturbation in view of (H3). For type b, we use a more delicate construction. We write $M_0 = M^{\tilde{i}_0}$. (M_0 is chosen in order that the total degree of the semi-algebraic set describing the bad set in ω, $\mathcal{V}$, θ is not too large.)

The M_0 intervals are at $[\tilde{i}_0]^{th}$ scale. On M_0 intervals of type b, we use Lemma 4.1, which is for $T_{M_0}(y_{i_0})$, $i_0 \simeq \frac{\log M}{\log b}\tilde{i}_0 < i$ similar to (4.9). Using a decomposition lemma ([Lemma 9.9, B5] restated here as Lemma 5.3) to make appropriate incisions in the $(\omega, \mathcal{V})$-parameter space, applying (H2) between y_{i_0} and y_i and combining with estimates on type a intervals, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\|(R_J T(y_i) R_J)^{-1}\| < e^{M_0^\beta} \qquad (0<\beta<1) \\ &|(R_J T(y_i) R_J)^{-1}(k,k')| < e^{-\alpha''|k-k'|}, k, k' \in J, |k-k'| > \frac{M_0}{10}, \end{aligned} \tag{5.14}$$

where $\alpha'' = \alpha - M^{-i\delta''}$ ($\delta'' > 0$), for all

$$J = [-M_0, M_0]^{d+\nu} + k, \frac{1}{2}M^i < |k| < M^{i+1}. \tag{5.15}$$

This is the content of Lemma 5.2. We delay its precise statement and proof momentarily. We first prove

Lemma 5.1. *Assume (5.12-5.15) hold. M_0 is as in (5.5). Then*

$$\|[T_{M^{i+1}}(y_i)]^{-1}\| < \mathcal{O}(1) M^{(i+1)^C} \tag{5.16}$$

$$|[T_{M^{i+1}}(y_i)]^{-1}(k,k')| < e^{-\tilde{\alpha}|k-k'|} \textit{ for } |k-k'| > (i+1)^C, \tag{5.17}$$

with $\tilde{\alpha} = \alpha - M^{-(i+1)\tilde{\delta}}$, $\tilde{\delta} > 0$.

Proof. (5.16, 5.17) are exercises in resolvent identity or equivalently using Lemma B in the appendix. We first prove (5.16). (5.17) then follows by using (5.16) and another application of the resolvent identity. Let

$$B_i = [-M^i, M^i]^{d+\nu}, B_{i+1} = [-M^{i+1}, M^{i+1}]^{d+\nu}.$$

For any $k, \ell \in B_{i+1}$, we have (Assume $T^{-1}_{B_{i+1}}$ is defined.)

$$\begin{aligned} &T^{-1}_{B_{i+1}}(k, \ell) \\ &= T^{-1}_{W(k)}(k, \ell) + \sum_{\substack{k' \in \partial_* W(k) \\ |k''-k'|=1 \\ k'' \in B_{i+1} \backslash W(k)}} T^{-1}_{W(k)}(k, k') T^{-1}_{B_{i+1}}(k'', \ell) \end{aligned} \tag{5.18}$$

for $|k| \leq \frac{1}{2} M^i, W(k) = B_i$, for $|k| > \frac{1}{2} M^i$, $W(k)$ is a size M_0 interval. It is easy to see that $\forall k'$, $\exists W(k)$, such that $\text{dist}(k', \partial_* W(k)) \geq M_0$, where $\partial_* W(k)$ is the interior boundary of $W(k)$, relative to B_{i+1}. Summing over $\ell \in B_{i+1}$ yields

$$\begin{aligned} &\sup_{k \in B_{i+1}} \sum_{\ell \in B_{i+1}} |T^{-1}_{B_{i+1}}(k, \ell)| \leq \sup_{k \in B_{i+1}} \sum_{\ell \in W(k)} \|T^{-1}_{W(k)}\| \\ &+ \sup_{k \in B_{i+1}} \sum_{k' \in \partial_* W(k)} |T^{-1}_{W(k)}(k, k')| \sup_{k'' \in B_{i+1}} \sum_{\ell \in B_{i+1}} |T^{-1}_{B_{i+1}}(k'', \ell)|. \end{aligned} \tag{5.19}$$

Using (5.12-5.15), we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\sup_{k \in B_{i+1}} \sum_{\ell \in B_{i+1}} |T^{-1}_{B_{i+1}}(k, \ell)| \leq 2M^{i^C} \cdot (2M^i + 1)^{d+\nu} \\ &+ \mathcal{O}(1) e^{-cM_0} M_0^{d+\nu-1} \sup_{k'' \in B_{i+1}} \sum_{\ell \in B_{i+1}} |T^{-1}_{B_{i+1}}(k'', \ell)|, \end{aligned} \tag{5.20}$$

since $M^i \gg M_0$. So

$$\|T^{-1}_{B_{i+1}}\| \leq M^{(i+1)^C},$$

which is (5.16).

To obtain (5.17), we retrace our steps back to (5.18) and restrict to k, ℓ, such that $|k - \ell| > (i+1)^C \gg M_0$, in view of (5.5). Iterating (5.18) along the path from k to ℓ using B_i, J and using (5.16) for the last factor, we obtain (5.17). □

(5.16, 5.17) will be the conclusion of (H4, iii) at stage $i+1$ once we specify the new set of intervals Σ_{i+1}, on which they hold. As alluded to earlier, Σ_{i+1} will be determined from Σ_i and the new restriction on $(\omega, \mathcal{V})$ in order that (5.14, 5.15) hold.

Determination of Σ_{i+1}

Lemma 5.2. *Assume (H1-4) at stage i. There exists $\tilde{\Gamma}_i \subset \Gamma_i$, $\text{mes}_\nu \tilde{\Gamma}_i < M^{-i/4}$, such that (5.14, 5.15) hold on*

$$\bigcup_{I \in \Lambda_i} (I \cap (\Gamma_i \backslash \tilde{\Gamma}_i). \tag{5.21}$$

The proof of (5.21) relies on the measure estimates in Lemma 4.1 and semi-algebraic description of the bad set. We need the following decomposition lemma, which is proven in [B5, Lemma 9.9].

Lemma 5.3. *Let $\mathcal{S} \subset [0,1]^{2n}$ be a semi-algebraic set of degree B and $\text{mes}_{2n}\mathcal{S} < \eta, \log B \ll \log 1/\eta$. Denote by $(x,y) \in [0,1]^n \times [0,1]^n$ the product variable. Fix $\varepsilon > \eta^{1/2n}$. Then there is a decomposition*

$$\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}_1 \bigcup \mathcal{S}_2,$$

with $\mathcal{S}_1$ satisfying

$$|Proj_x \mathcal{S}_1| < B^K \epsilon \quad (K > 0) \tag{5.22}$$

and $\mathcal{S}_2$ satisfying the transversality property

$$\text{mes}_n(\mathcal{S}_2 \cap L) < B^K \epsilon^{-1} \eta^{1/2n} \quad (K > 0), \tag{5.23}$$

for any n-dimensional hyperplane L such that

$$\max_{1 \le j \le n} |Proj_L(e_j)| < \frac{1}{100}\epsilon \tag{5.24}$$

where e_j are the basis vectors for the x-coordinates.

Proof of Lemma 5.2. Assume (5.14, 5.15) hold with $T(y_{i_0})$ replacing $T(y_i)$, where as before

$$i_0 \simeq \frac{\log M}{\log b} \tilde{i}_0 \sim \frac{\log M_0}{\log b} < i, \tag{5.25}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\|(R_J T(y_{i_0}) R_J)^{-1}\| < e^{M_0^\beta}, \qquad (0 < \beta < 1) \\ &|(R_J T(y_{i_0}) R_J)^{-1}(k,k')| < e^{-\alpha|k-k'|}, k, k' \in J, |k-k'| > \frac{M_0}{10}, \end{aligned} \tag{5.26}$$

for all

$$J = [-M_0, M_0]^{d+\nu} + k, \frac{1}{2}M^i < |k| < M^{i+1}. \tag{5.27}$$

Recall that we are at stage i, so (H2) is satisfied. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \|T(y_i) - T(y_{i_0})\| &< \mathcal{O}(1)\delta_{i_0} \\ &< e^{-\alpha M_0} \end{aligned} \tag{5.28}$$

using (5.25). This in turn implies that (5.14, 5.15) hold. So we only need to prove (5.26). ((5.28) is in fact a reason for the choice of M_0 in (5.5).)

Fix $I \in \Sigma_{i_0}$. For type a intervals, using (H3) for y_{i_0}, the off-diagonal elements in the n-direction of S has exponential decay and $\|S\| \leq \mathcal{O}(\delta e^{-\alpha M_0})$. We use A. L. for the random Schrödinger operator $\epsilon\Delta_j + V_j$ to obtain (5.26) as follows.

To obtain the first estimate in (5.26), we make direct incisions in the frequency space. Let J be a type a interval. We require

$$\begin{aligned} &| \pm n \cdot \omega + \epsilon\Delta_j + V_j| \\ =&| \pm n \cdot \omega + \mu_j| \\ \geq& 2e^{-M_0^\beta}, \end{aligned}$$

for all $(n, j) \in J$, where μ_j are the eigenvalues of $\epsilon\Delta_j + V_j$ restricted to the projection of J onto $\mathbb{Z}^d$.

When $n \neq 0$, this amounts to taking away a set in Ω of measure $\leq \mathcal{O}(1)e^{-M_0^\beta} \cdot M_0^{d+\nu}$. When $n = 0$, this is satisfied for $x \in X$ in view of (5.0). So

$$\|(R_J T(y_{i_0}) R_j)^{-1}\| < e^{M_0^\beta},$$

by using the exponential estimates on S. This gives the first estimate in (5.26).

To obtain the second estimate in (5.26), we use Anderson localization, i.e., on the probability set X defined in (4.12), for all E (here $E = n \cdot \omega$) there exists at most 1 pairwise disjoint bad elementary regions in $\mathbb{Z}^d$ of size $M_0^{1/C}$ in the projection of J onto $\mathbb{Z}^d$. A resolvent series in the j direction coupled with a resolvent series in the n direction using the above 2 estimates and the decay property of S gives the second estimate in (5.26), cf. proof of Lemma 4.3.

Hence there is a set $\bar{\Gamma} \subset \Gamma_{i_0} \cap I$,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{mes}_\nu \bar{\Gamma} &< \mathcal{O}(1)e^{-M_0^\beta} M^{(i+1)(d+\nu)} M_0^{d+\nu} \quad (0 < \beta < 1) \\ &< M^{-i} \end{aligned} \tag{5.29}$$

such that outside $\bar{\Gamma}$, (5.26) hold for all $J \subset [-M^{i+1}, M^{i+1}]^{d+\nu}$ satisfying $J \cap [-M_0, M_0]^d \times [-M^{i+1}, M^{i+1}]^\nu = \emptyset$.

To prove (5.26) for type b intervals J, we use Lemma 4.1 at scale $\tilde{i}_0 = [\frac{\log M_0}{\log M}]$ and the decomposition Lemma 5.3. We illustrate this on the interval $J = [-M_0, M_0]^{d+\nu}$. We consider the set

$$\mathcal{S} = \{(\omega, \mathcal{V}, \theta) \in I \times \mathbb{R} | \text{ (4.9) fail for } T^\theta_{[-M_0,M_0]^{d+\nu}}(y_{i_0}), \text{ i.e., with } N \text{ replaced by } M_0, y_i, \text{ replaced by } y_{i_0}\}, \tag{5.30}$$

where $I \in \Sigma_{i_0}$ is the same fixed interval as earlier. (Recall that $x \in X \subset \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{Z}^d} \backslash \mathbb{R}^\nu$ is fixed.) Let $T^\theta_{M_0}(y_{i_0})$ denote $T^\theta_{[-M_0,M_0]^{d+\nu}}(y_{i_0})$. Each matrix element of $T^\theta_{M_0}(y_{i_0})$ is a rational function in $\omega, \mathcal{V}$ of degree at most $2(p+1)M^{q{i_0}^3}(q \in \mathbb{N}^+)$ and linear in θ (see (H4, i), (4.2-4.4, 4.7)). As before, the condition in (5.30) can be expressed in terms of determinants and hence polynomials in the matrix elements of $T^\theta_{M_0}(y_{i_0})$. This gives that $\mathcal{S}$ is semi-algebraic of total degree at most $M_0^{C(d+\nu)} M^{q i_0^3}$ on $\mathbb{R}^{2\nu+1}$.

We now localize to $(\omega, \mathcal{V}) \in \Gamma_{i_0}$. We consider the set

$$\mathcal{S}' \overset{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{S} \bigcap \{(I \cap \Gamma_{i_0} \cap \{DC_{A,c}(2M_0) \backslash \Omega_{M_0}\}) \times \mathbb{R}\} \subset \mathbb{R}^{\nu+1}, \tag{5.31}$$

where Ω_{M_0} is as in (4.54) of Lemma 4.7 with N replaced by M_0, Γ_{i_0} is determined by the Q-equations in (2.12), which are polynomials in $(\omega, \mathcal{V})$ of degree at most $2(p+1)M^{q i_0^3}(q \in \mathbb{N}^+)$. From Lemma 4.7, (4.54), $DC_{A,c}(2M_0) \backslash \Omega_{M_0}$ is determined by $M_0^{C^2(d+\nu)} \sim M^{C^2(d+\nu) i_0}$ number of monomials of degree 1. So $\mathcal{S}'$ is semi-algebraic of total degree at most $M^{(q+1) i_0^3}$ on $\mathbb{R}^{\nu+1}$.

By Lemma 4.1, each section $\mathcal{S}'(\omega, \mathcal{V}) = \mathcal{S}'\big(\omega(\mathcal{V}), \mathcal{V}\big)$ is of measure at most $e^{-M_0^\sigma}$ in θ $(0 < \sigma < 1/2)$. So

$$\text{mes}_{\nu+1} \mathcal{S}' \leq e^{-M_0^\sigma} \qquad (0 < \sigma < 1/2). \tag{5.32}$$

Our aim is to estimate for $k \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu$, $\frac{1}{2}M^i < |k| \leq M^{i+1}$,

$$\text{mes}_\nu \{\mathcal{V} | \big(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{V} + (\epsilon + \delta)\varphi_{i_0}(\mathcal{V}), k \cdot (\mathcal{V} + (\epsilon + \delta)\varphi_{i_0}(\mathcal{V}))\big) \in \mathcal{S}'\}. \tag{5.33}$$

Since Γ_{i_0} is a C^1 function, $(I \cap \Gamma_{i_0}) \times \mathbb{R}$ may be identified with an interval in $\mathbb{R}^{\nu+1}$, say $[0,1]^\nu \times \mathbb{R}$, $\mathcal{S}'$ defined in (5.31) is a subset of $(I \cap \Gamma_{i_0}) \times \mathbb{R}$, and therefore can be identified with a subset in $[0,1]^\nu \times \mathbb{R}$. For the purpose of the application of Lemma 5.3, we identify $[0,1]^\nu \times \mathbb{R}$ with $[0,1]^\nu \times [0,1]^{\nu-1} \times \mathbb{R}$ and $\mathcal{S}'$ with $\mathcal{S}' \times [0,1]^{\nu-1}$. Since T is restricted to the interval $[-M_0, M_0]^{d+\nu}$, we may further restrict the interval in $[0,1]^\nu \times \mathbb{R}$ to be

$$[0,1]^\nu \times [-\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{d+\nu})M_0, \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{d+\nu})M_0] \simeq [0,1]^{2\nu-1} \times [-\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{d+\nu})M_0, \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{d+\nu})M_0]. \tag{5.34}$$

We decompose $[-\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{d+\nu})M_0, \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{d+\nu})M_0]$ into intervals of length 1 and identify each of them with $[0,1]$. Applying the decomposition Lemma 5.3 to each of these intervals and taking the union, we obtain a subset $\Gamma' \subset \Gamma_{i_0} \cap I$ of measure

$$\begin{aligned} \text{mes}_\nu \Gamma' &< (M^{(q+1)i_0^3})^C M^{-i} \cdot \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{d+\nu})M_0 \\ &< M^{-i/2}, \end{aligned} \tag{5.35}$$

(Recall $\mathcal{S}'$ is of degree $B \leq M^{q i_0^3} (q \in \mathbb{N}^+)$ and we take $\epsilon = 200M^{-i}$ in (5.22).) such that for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu, |k| > \frac{1}{2}M^i$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathrm{mes}_\nu\{\mathcal{V}|(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{V} + (\epsilon+\delta)\varphi_{i_0}(\mathcal{V}), k\cdot\big(\mathcal{V} + (\varepsilon+\delta)\varphi_{i_0}(\mathcal{V})\big)\\
&\in \mathcal{S} \cap \{\big((\Gamma_{i_0}\backslash\Gamma') \cap I \cap \{DC_{A,c}(2M_0)\backslash\Omega_{M_0}\}\big) \times \mathbb{R}\}\\
&< e^{-M_0^{\sigma/2}} \qquad (0 < \sigma < 1/2),
\end{aligned} \tag{5.36}$$

where M_0 is as in (5.5).

Same estimates as in (5.35, 5.36) hold when $T_{[-M_0,M_0]^{d+\nu}}$ is replaced by $T_{[-M_0,M_0]^{d+\nu}+\ell}$, $\ell \in \mathbb{Z}^d \cap [-2M_0, 2M_0]^d$. Therefore, there is a set $\Gamma'' \subset \Gamma_{i_0} \cap I$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{mes}_\nu\Gamma'' &< \mathcal{O}(1)M^{-i/2} + \mathcal{O}(1)M^{(i+1)(d+\nu)}e^{-M_0^{\sigma/2}}\\
&< M^{-i/3}
\end{aligned} \tag{5.37}$$

(in view of the choice of M_0 in (5.5) and $C\sigma \gg 1$ from (4.58)), such that outside Γ'', (4.9) hold for all intervals J of the form $[-M_0, M_0]^{d+\nu} + \ell, \ell \in \mathbb{Z}^d \cap [-2M_0, 2M_0]^d$, $y_{i'} = y_{i_0}$ and $\theta = k \cdot \omega, k \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu, \frac{1}{2}M^i < |k| < M^{i+1}$. (The condition: $\cap\{DC_{A,c}(2M_0)\backslash\Omega_{M_0}\}$ in (5.36) does not require additional incisions in the frequency space, as (H4, 0) holds starting at stage $i_0 + 1$.)

Combined with (5.29) and previous perturbation argument of replacing y_i by y_{i_0} in (5.28), this implies that $\exists\Gamma'''$, $\mathrm{mes}_\nu\Gamma''' < M^{-i/3}$, such that outside Γ''', (5.14, 5.15) hold for all k, $\frac{1}{2}M^i < |k| < M^{i+1}$, and a fixed $I \in \Sigma_{i_0}$.

Letting I range over Σ_{i_0}, (There can be at most $\mathcal{O}(1)M^{i_0^C}$ of these intervals, as the $(\omega, \mathcal{V})$-parameter space can be restricted to, say $[0,1]^{2\nu}$.) the total measure removed from Γ_{i_0} is at most $M^{i_0^C} \cdot M^{-i/3} < M^{-i/4}$. Since Γ_{i_0} and Γ_i are at distance $< \delta_{i_0} < e^{-\alpha M_0}$ from (5.3), we obtain a subset $\tilde{\Gamma}_i \subset \Gamma_i$, $\mathrm{mes}_\nu\tilde{\Gamma}_i < M^{-i/4}$ such that (5.14, 5.15) hold for all k, $M^i/2 < |k| < M^{i+1}$ and on

$$\bigcup_{I\in\Sigma_{i_0}} \big(I \cap (\Gamma_i\backslash\tilde{\Gamma}_i)\big) \tag{5.38}$$

and hence on

$$\bigcup_{I\in\Sigma_{i}} \big(I \cap (\Gamma_i\backslash\tilde{\Gamma}_i)\big) \tag{5.39}$$

by (H4, iv). This proves the Lemma. □

Lemma 5.1 then gives that on the set in (5.39), (5.16, 5.17) hold. Clearly by perturbation, (5.16, 5.17) remain valid on a $M^{-(i+1)^C}$ neighborhood of (5.39), (since $M^{-(i+1)^C} \ll e^{-\alpha M_0} \sim e^{-\alpha(i+1)^{C/2}}$ by the choice of M_0 in (5.5)), which in turn generates a collection Λ_{i+1} of intervals in $\mathbb{R}^{2\nu}$ of size $M^{-(i+1)^C}$, such that for $(\omega, \mathcal{V}) \in I \in$

Λ_{i+1}, (5.16, 5.17) hold. So (H4, iii) hold at stage $i+1$ with $\tilde{\alpha} = \alpha - M^{-(i+1)^{\tilde{\delta}}}$ $(\tilde{\delta} > 0)$, replacing α. Moreover we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathrm{mes}_\nu\Big(\bigcup_{I \in \Lambda_i} (I \cap \Gamma_i) \backslash \bigcup_{I' \in \Lambda_{i+1}} (I' \cap \Gamma_i)\Big)\\ &\leq \mathrm{mes}_\nu \tilde{\Gamma}_i < M^{-i/4}\end{aligned} \tag{5.40}$$

which will imply (H4, iv) at stage $i+1$, once we construct y_{i+1} and hence Γ_{i+1} using (H4, iii) at stage $i+1$.

6. CONSTRUCTION OF y_{i+1} AND COMPLETION OF THE ASSEMBLAGE

Construction of y_{i+1}

Let $N = M^{i+1}$, for $(\omega, \mathcal{V}) \in \cup_{I \in \Lambda_{i+1}} I$, define

$$\Delta_{i+1} y = y_{i+1} - y_i \overset{\mathrm{def}}{=} -(T_N(y_i))^{-1} F(y_i), \tag{6.1}$$

(previously (3.9)). In view of (3.1, 2.16, H4,i), this implies that $\Delta_{i+1} y$ is a rational function in $(\omega, \mathcal{V})$ of degree at most

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathcal{O}(1) N^{d+\nu} M^{qi^3} + (2p+1) M^{qi^3}\\ <&M^{q(i+1)^3} \qquad (q \in \mathbb{N}^+).\end{aligned} \tag{6.2}$$

(Recall $p < M$.) So (H4, i) holds at stage $i+1$. (5.16), (H4,ii) give

$$\|\Delta_{i+1} y\| < M^{(i+1)^C} \kappa_i = \delta_{i+1} \tag{6.3}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\|\partial(\Delta_{i+1} y)\| &< \|\partial T_N^{-1}\| \|F(y_i)\| + \|T_N^{-1}\| \|\partial F(y_i)\|\\ &< \|T_N^{-1}\|^2 \|y_i\|_{C^1} \kappa_i + \|T_N^{-1}\| \bar{\kappa}_i\\ &< M^{2(i+1)^C} \bar{\kappa}_i\\ &= \bar{\delta}_{i+1},\end{aligned} \tag{6.4}$$

where we also used (H2). Next we obtain point wise estimate on $\Delta_{i+1} y$. From (6.1)

$$|\Delta_{i+1} y(k)| \leq \sum_{|k'| \leq N} |T_N^{-1}(k, k')| |F(y_i)(k')|. \tag{6.5}$$

(2.16) gives

$$\begin{aligned}|F(y_i)(k')| &\leq \mathcal{O}(1) \sum_{k_1 + \cdots + k_{2p+1} = k'} |y_i(k_1)| \cdots |y_i(k_{2p+1})|\\ &\leq (CM)^{CM} |k'|^{(d+\nu)M} e^{-\alpha |k'|},\end{aligned} \tag{6.6}$$

(since $p < M$). Substituting (5.17, 6.6) into (6.5), we then obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |\Delta_{i+1}y(k)| &\leq (CM)^{CM}\{\sum_{|k-k'|<i^C} M^{i^C}|k'|^{(d+\nu)M}e^{-\alpha|k'|} \\ &\quad+\sum_{|k-k'|\geq i^C}|k'|^{(d+\nu)M}e^{-\tilde{\alpha}(|k'|+|k-k'|)}\} \\ &< C'M^{2i^C}|k|^{(d+\nu)M}e^{-\tilde{\alpha}|k|}. \end{aligned} \tag{6.7}$$

Using (6.3) for k, such that $\log|k| \lesssim i$ and (6.7) otherwise, we obtain

$$|y_{i+1}(k)| < e^{(\log|k|)^{C'}-\tilde{\alpha}|k|} \leq e^{-\bar{\alpha}|k|}, \tag{6.8}$$

with $\bar{\alpha} = \alpha - M^{-(i+1)\bar{\delta}}$ for some $\bar{\delta} > 0$ independent of i, where we used the estimate on $\tilde{\alpha}$ just above (5.40). This shows that (H3) is essetially preserved at stage $i+1$. Here we used the fact that $\alpha = \mathcal{O}(1)|\log(\epsilon+\delta)|$ and $0 < \epsilon \ll 1$, $0 < \delta \ll 1$.

Since the intervals in Λ_{i+1} are of size $M^{-(i+1)^C}$, we may extend $\Delta_{i+1}y$ to the entire $(\omega, \mathcal{V})$ parameter space as follows. For any $I \in \Lambda_{i+1}$, let $\tilde{I} \subset I$ be such that $\mathrm{dist}(\Lambda_{i+1}^c, \tilde{I}) \sim (1/3)M^{-(i+1)^C}$. Set $\Delta y'_{i+1} = \Delta y_{i+1}$ on I, $\Delta y'_{i+1} = 0$ on Λ_{i+1}^c. Define a C^1 function

$$\Xi_{i+1} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{on}\, \tilde{I} \\ 0 & \text{on}\, \Lambda_{i+1}^c. \end{cases} \tag{6.9}$$

Define

$$\Delta\tilde{y}_{i+1} = \Xi_{i+1}\Delta y'_{i+1}. \tag{6.10}$$

$\Delta\tilde{y}_{i+1}$ is defined on the whole $(\omega, \mathcal{V})$-parameter space and satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial\Delta\tilde{y}_{i+1}\| &< 3M^{(i+1)^C}\delta_{i+1} + M^{2(i+1)^C}\bar{\kappa}_i \\ &= \bar{\delta}_{i+1}, \end{aligned} \tag{6.11}$$

where the second contribution comes from (6.4). Renaming $\Delta\tilde{y}_i$, Δy_i and letting $y_{i+1} = y_i + \Delta y_i$, we have thus shown that (H1-3) remain valid at stage $i+1$ with $\bar{\alpha}$ replacing α.

From y_{i+1}, the Q-equations in (2.12) define Γ_{i+1} at most at a distance $\delta_{i+1} \simeq M^{-b^{i+1}} \ll M^{-i/4}$ from Γ_i. Clearly (5.40) implies

$$\mathrm{mes}_\nu(\Gamma_{i+1} \cap (\cup_{I\in\Lambda_i} I \backslash \cup_{I'\in\Lambda_{i+1}} I')) < M^{-i/4} < M^{-(i+1)/5}, \tag{6.12}$$

which is (H4,iv) at stage $i+1$.

It remains to verify the properties of $F(y_{i+1})$ in (H4,ii), stage $i+1$. From the Taylor series in (3.10),

$$F(y_{i+1}) = -[(T-T_N)[T_N(y_i)]^{-1}]F(y_i) + \mathcal{O}(1)\|\Delta_{i+1}y\|^2, \qquad N = M^{i+1}. \tag{6.13}$$

By construction, (H1), $\text{supp} y_i \subset [-M^i, M^i]^{d+\nu}$, (2.16) gives therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{supp}F(y_i) &\subset [-(2p+1)M^i, (2p+1)M^i]^{d+\nu} \\ &\subset [-M^{i+1}/10, M^{i+1}/10]^{d+\nu} \\ &= [-N/10, N/10]^{d+\nu}. \end{aligned} \tag{6.14}$$

So

$$\begin{aligned} F(y_{i+1}) &= [R_{\mathbb{Z}^{d+\nu}\setminus B(0,N)} T T_N^{-1} R_{B(0,N/10)}] F(y_i) + \mathcal{O}(1)\|\Delta_{i+1}y\|^2, \\ \|F(y_{i+1})\| &\le \|R_{\mathbb{Z}^{d+\nu}\setminus B(0,N)} T T_N^{-1} R_{B(0,N/10)}\| \|F(y_i)\| + \mathcal{O}(1)\|\Delta_{i+1}y\|^2, \end{aligned} \tag{6.15}$$

where $B(0,N) = [-N,N]^{d+\nu}$, $R_{B(0,N)}$, $R_{B(0,N/10)}$ are characteristic functions. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \|F(y_{i+1})\| &\le e^{-\alpha N/3}\kappa_i + \mathcal{O}(1)\delta_{i+1}^2 \\ &= \kappa_{i+1}, \end{aligned} \tag{6.16}$$

where we used (H2,3,4,ii).

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{O}(1)\|\partial F(y_{i+1})\| \le\, & \|T_N^{-1}\|\|\partial T\|\|F(y_i)\| + \|\partial T_N^{-1}\|\|F(y_i)\|\|T\| \\ &+ \|R_{\mathbb{Z}^{d+\nu}\setminus B(0,N)} T T_N^{-1} R_{B(0,N/10)}\| \|\partial F(y_i)\| \\ &+ \|\Delta_{i+1}y\|\|\partial \Delta_{i+1}y\| \\ <\, & M^{2(i+1)^C}\kappa_i + e^{-\alpha M^{i+1}/3}\bar{\kappa}_i + \delta_{i+1}\bar{\delta}_{i+1}, \end{aligned} \tag{6.17}$$

and we may take

$$\bar{\kappa}_{i+1} = \mathcal{O}(1)(M^{2(i+1)^C}\kappa_i + e^{-\alpha M^{i+1}/3}\bar{\kappa}_i + \delta_{i+1}\bar{\delta}_{i+1}). \tag{6.18}$$

Summarizing (6.3, 6.4, 6.16-6.18), we have

$$\begin{cases} \delta_{i+1} = M^{(i+1)^C}\kappa_i \\ \bar{\delta}_{i+1} = M^{2(i+1)^C}\bar{\kappa}_i \\ \kappa_{i+1} = e^{-\alpha M^{i+1}/3}\kappa_i + \mathcal{O}(1)\delta_{i+1}^2 \\ \bar{\kappa}_{i+1} = \mathcal{O}(1)(M^{2(i+1)^C}\kappa_i + e^{-\alpha M^{i+1}/3}\bar{\kappa}_i + \delta_{i+1}\bar{\delta}_{i+1}). \end{cases} \tag{6.19}$$

We start from κ_0, $\bar{\kappa}_0 = \mathcal{O}(1)(\epsilon+\delta)$. For $\epsilon+\delta$ small enough, (6.19) is satisfied for $i \geq 1$, if

$$\begin{cases} \delta_i < \sqrt{\epsilon+\delta}M^{-(\frac{4}{3})^i}, & \kappa_i < \sqrt{\epsilon+\delta}M^{-(\frac{4}{3})^{i+2}}, \\ \bar{\delta}_i < \sqrt{\epsilon+\delta}M^{-\frac{1}{2}(\frac{4}{3})^i}, & \bar{\kappa}_i < \sqrt{\epsilon+\delta}M^{-\frac{1}{2}(\frac{4}{3})^{i+2}}. \end{cases} \tag{6.20}$$

(H4,0) and initial input for the induction

To ensure (H4,0) at stage $i+1$, we make further incisions. (This is in order that Lemma 4.1 remains at our disposal at a later stage.) On Γ_{i+1}, we need to eliminate ω such that

$$\begin{cases} |n\cdot\omega_{i+1} + \lambda_{jj'}| \leq e^{-M_0^{\beta'}} & (n \sim \mathcal{O}(1)M_0), \\ \|n\cdot\omega_{i+1}\|_{\mathbb{T}} \leq \frac{c}{|n|^A} & (0<|n|<2M^{i+1}), \end{cases} \tag{6.21}$$

where M_0 is as in (5.5, H(4, 0)), $\beta' = \beta/\mathcal{O}(1)$, $\mathcal{O}(1)$ is the same expansion factor as in Lemma 4.6 (denoted C there), $\lambda_{jj'} = \mu_j - \mu_{j'}$, μ_j, $\mu_{j'}$ are the eigenvalues of the random Schrödinger operator $\epsilon\Delta_j + V_j$ restricted to the myriad elementary regions of size $M_0^{1/\mathcal{O}(1)}$ (the same expansion factor $\mathcal{O}(1)$) in $[-3M_0, 3M_0]^d$ (see Lemmas 4.1, 4.2, 4.6, proof of Lemma 4.2, (4.8, 4.9), the remark after (4.9, 4.26, 4.54) and the definition of Ω_i in (H4, 0)). There are at most $\mathcal{O}(1)M_0^{C'd}$ $(C'>0)$ of such differences of eigenvalues.

In view of (5.2) at stage $i+1$, the first equation in (6.21) removes a set $\bar{\Gamma}_{i+1} \subset \Gamma_{i+1}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{mes}_\nu \bar{\Gamma}_{i+1} &\leq e^{-M_0^{\beta''}} \qquad (0<\beta''<\beta') \\ &\sim e^{-[(i+1)^{C/2}(\log M)^{C/2}]^{\beta''}} \\ &\ll M^{-\frac{i+1}{5}}, \end{aligned} \tag{6.22}$$

using (5.5) and choosing

$$C > \frac{\mathcal{O}(1)\log M}{\beta},$$

which is always possible.

Since

$$\|\omega_{i+1} - \omega_i\| \leq \delta_i = M^{-(4/3)^i} \ll \frac{1}{M^{iA}} \tag{6.23}$$

from (5.2, 5.3, 6.20), we only need to remove ω_{i+1} such that

$$\|n\cdot\omega_{i+1}\|_{\mathbb{T}} \leq \frac{c}{|n|^A}$$

for $M^i \leq |n| \leq M^{i+1}$, which removes a set $\tilde{\Gamma}_{i+1} \subset \Gamma_{i+1}$,

$$\text{mes}_\nu \tilde{\Gamma}_{i+1} \leq \frac{\mathcal{O}(1)}{M^{iA}} \ll M^{-\frac{i+1}{5}} \tag{6.24}$$

Rename α as α_i, $\bar{\alpha}$ as α_{i+1}. From (6.8), $\alpha_{i+1} = \alpha_i - M^{-(i+1)\bar{\delta}} > \alpha/2$ uniformly in i. Combining (6.22, 6.24), we have (H4,0) at stage $i+1$ and that (6.12) is preserved. We have thus made a complete induction from stage i to $i+1$.

7. Proof of the Theorem

The "proof of the theorem" is now just a matter of juxtaposing sections 4, 5, 6 and recalling the sequence of events. We recount the spine of the argument.

We use the modified Newton scheme in (3.9) to construct approximate solutions:

$$\Delta_{i+1} y = y_{i+1} - y_i = -(T_N(y_i))^{-1} F(y_i),\ N = M^{i+1}, \tag{7.1}$$

where T_N is T restricted to $[-N, N]^{d+\nu}$, T and F are as in (3.3-3.5, 3.1). Assume we have obtained the first i approximations $y_1, ..., y_i$ on a set of intervals $\mathbb{R}^{2\nu} \supset \Lambda_1 \supset \cdots \supset \Lambda_i$. To obtain y_{i+1}, we need to control $(T_N(y_i))^{-1}$ with a further restriction to the new set of intervals Λ_{i+1} in $(\omega, \mathcal{V})$ space. This is accomplished as follows.

To estimate $T_N(y_i)$, we cover $[-M^{i+1}, M^{i+1}]^{d+\nu}$ with the interval $[-M^i, M^i]^{d+\nu} = I$ and smaller intervals $J = [-M_0, M_0]^{d+\nu} + k$, $M^i/2 < |k| < M^{i+1}$, $M_0 \sim (\log N)^{C/2}$ as in (5.5). T_I^{-1} is "good" on Λ_i by using perturbation theory. The J intervals are divided into 2 types as in section 5, according to their distances to the $\mathbb{Z}^d$ axis (see equations (a) and (b) between (5.13, 5.14)). T_J^{-1} of type a is easily obtained by using the manifest exponential decay properties of y_i and a direct incision in the frequency space. The main task is to control T_J^{-1} of type b, which leads to further incisions in the frequency space, hence the new set of intervals Λ_{i+1}.

Since $|J| \ll |I|$, we may consider $T_J(y_{i_0})$ instead of $T_J(y_i)$ for some $i_0 \ll i$ as in (5.25). We add a parameter θ to $T_J(y_{i_0})$ and estimate the measure of the set of θ, on the complement of which, $[T_J^{(\theta)}]^{-1}$ is "good". This is Lemma 4.1. We then use the decomposition Lemma 5.3 to transfer the estimate in θ into estimates in ω, giving rise to the new set of intervals Λ_{i+1}.

On Λ_{i+1} we construct y_{i+1} according to (7.1). Using the Q-equations in (2.12), we obtain Γ_{i+1}. The first i_0 approximations are constructed by using direct ϵ, δ series, in order that Lemma 4.7 and hence Lemma 4.1 are available: $i_0 \simeq \frac{1}{\beta} \log|\log(\epsilon + \delta)|$ from (4.57) and the third expression in (4.9) after setting $N = \tilde{N}_0^C$ and determining i, hence i_0. (6.20) gives the rate of convergence of this Newton scheme and hence the Theorem. □

Appendix: Localization results for random Schrödinger operators

Random Schrödinger operator is the operator

$$H = \epsilon\Delta + V \text{ on } \ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^d),$$

where $\epsilon > 0$ is a parameter, $\Delta(i,j) = 1$ if $|i-j| = 1$ and zero otherwise, $V = \{v_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{Z}^d}$ is a family of independent identically distributed (iid) random variables with common probability distribution g. The spectrum of H is given by

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma(H) &= \sigma(\epsilon\Delta) + \sigma(V) \\ &= [-2\epsilon d, 2\epsilon d] + \text{supp } g, \quad a.s.\end{aligned}$$

We summarize below the known results on Anderson localization, which are relevant for the present construction (cf. [DJLS, vDK, GB, GK, Mi, Si]). This is an expanded and more complete version of the appendix in [BW].

For any $L \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\Lambda_L(i)$ denote any elementary region in $\mathbb{Z}^d$ with diameter $2L$, center $i \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ as defined in (4.10, 4.11) with $\mathbb{Z}^d$ replacing $\mathbb{Z}^{d+\nu}$. Let $H_{\Lambda_L(i)}$ be H restricted to $\Lambda_L(i)$. Let $m > 0, E \in \mathbb{R}$. $\Lambda_L(i)$ is (m,E)-regular (for a fixed V) if $E \notin \sigma(H_{\Lambda_l(i)})$ and

$$|G_{\Lambda_L(i)}(E; j, j')| \leq e^{-m|j-j'|} \tag{A1}$$

for all $j, j' \in \Lambda_L(i), |j-j'| > L/4$. The following theorem is an immediate corollary of the corresponding theorem in [vDK] pertaining to cubes, by covering elementary regions with cubes and then an application of the resolvent equation (cf. Lemma B).

Theorem A. *Let $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ be a bounded interval. Suppose that for some $L_0 > 0$, we have*

$$\text{Prob}\,\{\textit{for any } E \in I \textit{ either } \Lambda_{L_0}(i) \textit{ or } \Lambda_{L_0}(j) \textit{ is } (m_0, E)\textit{-regular}\} \geq 1 - \frac{1}{L_0^{2p'}}, \tag{A2}$$

for some $p' > d, m_0 > 0$, and any $i, j \in \mathbb{Z}^d, |i-j| > 2L_0$

$$\text{Prob}\,\{\text{dist}\,(E, \sigma(H_{\Lambda_L(0)})) < e^{-L^\beta}\} \leq 1/L^{q'} \tag{A3}$$

for some β and q, $0 < \beta < 1$ and

$$q' > 4p' + 6d \tag{A4}$$

all E with

$$\text{dist}\,(E, I) \leq \frac{1}{2} e^{-L^\beta},$$

and all $L \geq L_0$. Then there exists $\alpha, 1 < \alpha < 2$, such that if we set $L_{k+1} = [L_k^\alpha] + 1$, $k = 0, 1, 2\ldots$ and pick $m, 0 < m < m_0$, there is $Q < \infty$, such that if $L_0 > Q$, we have that for any $k = 0, 1, 2\ldots$

$$\text{Prob}\,\{\textit{for any } E \in I \textit{ either } \Lambda_{L_k(i)} \textit{ or } \Lambda_{L_k(j)} \textit{ is } (m, E) \textit{ regular}\} \geq 1 - \frac{1}{L_k^{2p'}} \tag{A5}$$

for any $i, j \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ with $|i-j| > 2L_k$.

Remark. On the same probability subspace,

$$\operatorname{dist}\big(\sigma\big(H_{\Lambda_{L_k}(i)}\big), \sigma\big(H_{\Lambda_{L_k}(j)}\big)\big) > e^{-L_k^\beta}, \qquad \beta > 0 \tag{A6}$$

if $|i-j| > 2L_k$. This is part of the ingredient of the proof of Theorem A.

Let $S \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$ be an (arbitrary) finite set. Let H_S be H restricted to S. If the probability distribution is absolutely continuous with a bounded density $\tilde{g}$, we have the following Wegner lemma:

$$\text{Prob}\ \{\text{dist}\ (E, \sigma(H_S)) \le \kappa\} \le C\kappa|S|\|\tilde{g}\|_\infty, \quad C > 0,\, \kappa > 0. \tag{A7}$$

(A2) is verified if ϵ is sufficiently small. (A3, 5) are provided by (A7), if $\|\tilde{g}\|_\infty < \infty$. More precisely, fix $0 < \beta < 1$, choose q' and hence L_0 sufficiently large, then there exist ϵ sufficiently small such that (A2, 3) are verified. We note from (A4) that the larger the q', the larger the p' could be. In view of (A5), q' can be chosen large if L_0 is large. So p' can always be large enough by choosing ϵ small enough to suit the purpose of the construction in this paper (cf. Proof of Lemma 4.1).

Theorem A implies that for $0 < \epsilon \ll 1$, $\|\tilde{g}\|_\infty < \infty$, $\sigma(H)$ has pure point spectrum almost surely. The pure point spectrum is dense. However it is simple [Si]. Let ψ_n ($n \in \mathbb{Z}^d$) be the n^{th} eigenfunction of H, then

$$|\psi_n(j)| \le C_{n,\omega} e^{-m'|j|} \quad (0 < m' < m).$$

Further improvement of technology (see [A, DJLS1,2, GB, GK]) give in fact that

$$|\psi_n(j)| \le C_\omega P_\omega(j_{n,\omega}) e^{-m'|j-j_{n,\omega}|}, \tag{A8}$$

where the centers $j_{n,\omega}$ satisfy $|j_{n,\omega}| \gtrsim n^{1/d}$, and P_ω is a polynomial, which only depends on ω.

A resolvent estimate.

Lemma B. *Suppose $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{Z}^{d+\nu}$ is an arbitrary set with the following property: for every $x \in \Lambda$, there is a subset $W(x) \subset \Lambda$ with $x \in W(x)$, diam $(W(x)) \le N$ and such that Green's function $G_{W(x)}(E)$ satisfies for certain t, N, $A > 0$*

$$\|G_{W(x)}(E)\| < A \tag{B1}$$

$$|G_{W(x)}(E; x, y)| < e^{-tN} \quad \textit{for all } y \in \partial_* W(x). \tag{B2}$$

Here $\partial_* W(x)$ *is the interior boundary of* $W(x)$ *relative to* Λ *given by*

$$\partial_* W(x) = \{y' \in W(x) | \exists z \in \Lambda \backslash W(x), \quad |z - y'| = 1\}. \tag{B3}$$

Then

$$\|G_\Lambda(E)\| < 2N^2 A$$

provided $4N^2 e^{-tN} \leq \frac{1}{2}$.

See [BGS], where it is stated as Lemma 2.2, for a proof using the resolvent equation. See also the proof of Lemma 5.1 in section 5 of the present paper for an essentially identical exercise in resolvent equation. ☐

REFERENCES

[**A**] M. Aizenman, *Localization at weak disorder: some elementary bounds*, Rev. Math. Phys. **6** (1994), 1163-1182.

[**AFHS**] M. Aizenman, R. Friedrich, D. Hundertmark, S. Shankar, *Constructive fractional-moment criteria for localization in random operators*, Phys. A **279** (2000), 369-377.

[**AM**] M. Aizenman, S. Molchanov, *Localization at large disorder and at extreme energies: an elementary derivation*, Commun. Math. Phys. **157** (1993), 245.

[**AF**] C. Albanese, J. Fröhlich, *Periodic solutions of some infinite-dimensional Hamiltonian systems associated with non-linear partial difference equations I*, Commun. Math. Phys. **116** (1988), 475-502.

[**AFS**] C. Albanese, J. Fröhlich, T. Spencer, *Periodic solutions of some infinite-dimensional Hamiltonian systems associated with non-linear partial difference equations II*, Commun. Math. Phys. **119** (1988), 677-699.

[**An**] P. Anderson, *Absence of diffusion in certain random lattices*, Phys.Rev. **109** (1958), 1492.

[**Ba**] S. Basu, *On bounding the Betti numbers and computing the Euler characteristic of semi-algebraic sets*, Discrete Comput. Geom. **22** (1999), 1-18.

[**B1**] J. Bourgain, *Construction of quasi-periodic solutions for Hamiltonian perturbations of linear equations and applications to nonlinear PDE*, IMRN **11** (1994), 475-497.

[**B2**] J. Bourgain, *Construction of approximate and almost periodic solutions of perturbed linear Schrödinger and wave equations*, GAFA **6** (1996), 201-230.

[**B3**] J. Bourgain, *Quasi-periodic solutions of Hamiltonian perturbations of 2D linear Schrödinger equations*, Ann. Math **148** (1998), 363-439.

[**B4**] J. Bourgain, *Nonlinear Schrödinger equations*, Park City Lectures, 1999.

[**B5**] J. Bourgain, *Green's function estimates for latttice Schrödinger operators and applications*, Ann. Math. Studies **158** (2005), Princeton University Press.

[**B6**] J. Bourgain, *On invariant tori of full dimension for 1D periodic NLS*, J. Func. Anal. (2005).

[**BGS**] J. Bourgain, M. Goldstein, W. Schlag, *Anderson localization for Schrödinger operators on $\mathbb{Z}^2$ with quasi-periodic potential*, Acta Math. **188** (2002), 41-86.

[**BW**] J. Bourgain, W.-M. Wang, *Anderson localization for time quasi-periodic random Schrödinger and wave equations*, Commun. Math. Phys. **3** (2004), 429-466.

[**CP**] L. Chierchia, P. Perfetti, *Maximal almost-periodic solutions for Lagrangian equations on infinite dimensional tori*, Seminar on Dynamical Systems. Eds. S. Kuksin, V. Lazutkin, J. Pöschel. Birkhäuser, Basel (1994), 203-212.

[**CW1**] W. Craig, C. E. Wayne, *Newton's method and periodic solutions of nonlinear equations*, Commun. Pure Appl. Math. **46** (1993), 1409-1498.

[**CW2**] W. Craig, C. E. Wayne, *Periodic solutions of nonlinear Schrödinger equations and the Nash-Moser method*, Hamiltonian Mechanics, 103-122, Nato Adv. Sci. Inst. Ser. B Phys. 331, Plenum, NY, 1994.

[**CFKS**] H. L. Cycon, R. G. Froese, W. Kirsch, B. Simon, *Schrödinger Operators*, Springer-Verlag, 1987.

[**DJLS1**] R. Del Rio, S. Jitomirskaya, Y. Last, B. Simon, *What is localization*, Phys. Rev. Lett **75** (1995), 117-119.

[**DJLS2**] R. Del Rio, S. Jitomirskaya, Y. Last, B. Simon, *Operators with singular continuous spectrum IV: Hausdorff dimensions, rank one perturbations and localization*, J. d'Analyse Math. **69** (1996), 153-200.

[**vDK**] H. von Dreifus, A. Klein, *A new proof of localization in the Anderson tight binding model*, Commun. Math. Phys. **124** (1989), 285-299.

[**E**] L. H. Eliasson, *Perturbations of stable invariant tori for Hamiltonian systems*, Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa CI. Sci **15** (1988), 115-147.

[**EK**] L. H. Eliasson, S. E. Kuksin, *KAM for the nonlinear Schrödinger equation* (2006).

[**FMSS**] J. Fröhlich, F. Martinelli, E. Scoppola, T. Spencer, *Constructive proof of localization in Anderson tight binding model*, Commun. Math. Phys. **101** (1985), 21-46.

[**FS**] J. Fröhlich, T. Spencer, *Absence of diffusion in the Anderson tight binding model for large disorder or low energy*, Commun. Math. Phys. **88** (1983), 151-184.

[**FSW**] J. Fröhlich, T. Spencer, C. E. Wayne, *Localization in disordered, nonlinear dynamical systems*, J. Stat. Phys. **42** (1986), 247-274.

[**GB**] F. Germinet, S. de Bievre, *Dynamical localization for discrete and continuous random Schrödinger operators*, Commun. Math. Phys. **194** (1998), 322-341.

[**GK**] F. Germinet, A. Klein, *Bootstarp multiscale analysis and localization in random media*, Commun. Math. Phys. **222** (2001), 415-448.

[**GMP**] Ya. Gol'dsheid, S. Molchanov, L. Pastur, *Pure point spectrum of stochastic one dimensional Schrödinger operators*, Func. Anal. Appl **11, 1** (1977).

[**KP**] S. Kuksin, J. Pöschel, *Invariant Cantor manifolds of quasi-periodic osillations for a nonlinear Schrödinger equation*, Ann. Math. **143** (1996), 149-179.

[**Le**] Ya. B. Levin, *Lectures on Entire Functions*, Transl. of Math. Monographs, vol. 150, AMS, Providence, RI, 1996.

[**LZ**] B. M. Levitan, V. V. Zhikov, *Almost-Periodic Functions and Differential Equations*, von Nostrand Reinhold, NY, 1971.

[**LL**] E. H. Lieb, M. de Llano, *Solitons and the delta function fermion gas in the Hartree-Fock theory*, J. Math. Phys. **19** (1978), 860.

[**Mi**] N. Minami, *Local fluctuation of the spectrum of a multidimensional Anderson tight binding model*, Commun. Math. Phys. **177** (1996), 709-725.

[**O**] A. W. Overhauser, *Structure of nuclear matter*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **4** (1960), 415.

[**Pö1**] J. Pöschel, *Small divisors with spatial structure in infinite dimensional Hamiltonian systems*, Commun. Math. Phys. **127** (1990), 351-393.

[**Pö2**] J. Pöschel, *On the construction of almost periodic solutions for a nonlinear Schrödinger equation*, Ergod. Th. and Dynam. Sys. **22** (2002), 1537-1549.

[**PF**] L. Pastur, A. Figotin, *Spectra of Random and Almost Periodic Operators*, Springer, 1992.

[**Sh**] B. Sriram Shastry, *Exact solutions of a nonlinear eigenvalue problem in one dimension*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **50** (1983), 633.

[**Si**] B. Simon, *Cyclic vectors in the Anderson model*, Rev. Math. Phys. **6** (1994), 1183-1185.

[**W**] W.-M. Wang, *Pure point spectrum of the Floquet Hamiltonian for the quantum harmonic oscillator under time quasi-periodic perturbations*, submitted (2006).

[**Wy**] C. E. Wayne, *Periodic and quasi-periodic solutions of nonlinear wave equations via KAM theory*, Commun. Pure Appl. Math. **127** (1990), 479-528.

Institute for Advanced Study, Einstein Drive, Princeton, N.J. 08540, U.S.A.

E-mail address: `bourgain@math.ias.edu`

Département de Mathématique, Université Paris Sud, 91405 Orsay Cedex, FRANCE

E-mail address: `wei-min.wang@math.u-psud.fr`